

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 518 (NEW SERIES 128) AUG., 1907

CONTENTS

THE NEW SYLLABUS.....	113
THE GARIBALDI CENTENARY.....	115
GOD'S ORPHAN. III.....	132
THE REAL AUTHORS OF THE SEPARATION. Second Article.	
By Oswald Kellet	146
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD AND THE REFORMATION. II.	
By the Rev. Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B.	161
THE BURY PAGEANT.....	174
THE STORY OF A CONVERSION.....	179
MR. MCKENNA'S ANTI-CONSCIENCE CLAUSES.	
By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith	188
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....	207
"Roman Catholic" Correspondents.	
Cercles d'Études.	
REVIEWS.....	211
SHORT NOTICES.....	220
MAGAZINES.....	223

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.LIT.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Second Edition. Rewritten and Enlarged. (Fourth to Sixth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, and Bombay.



The New Syllabus.

FOR some time past the European newspapers have been announcing the forthcoming appearance of a new Syllabus, and have been indulging in speculations as to its likely character. Of one thing they were confident, it would declare war on the most certain acquisitions of modern investigation, and render the position of Catholic scholars henceforth impossible. This Syllabus has now been published. It is indeed not exactly a Syllabus, by which name is meant an Index of reference to authoritative documents otherwise issued, but a Decree of the Holy Office, embodying a series of condemned propositions, such as the Holy See has often issued in the past. It will, however, very probably come to be known as the Syllabus of Pius X., and the name will not be inappropriate. It has appeared so late in the month that it is impossible to give to it in the present number more than the brief word of respectful announcement and adhesion which is becoming, and to note that, as was to be expected, it is very far indeed from being what the critics had predicted.

In a sense, every ascertained truth limits the speculations of the human mind, for being an ascertained truth it must needs exclude as untenable every other proposition which is in conflict with it. When then some conclusion previously held and another more recently propounded are found to be mutually contradictory, and the contradiction on further inquiry proves to be real and not apparent only, the mind must consider which of the two is best established and adhere to that, treating the other as now disproved. This is the case in regard to all conflicts between conclusions independently arrived at, whatever be the departments of knowledge to which they respectively belong. Accordingly, when a real and not merely an apparent contradiction is detected between a doctrine of the Catholic Faith and an inference drawn by philosophers or historians or men of science, the only course open to a consistent thinker is to choose between concluding that the Church's creed is false and that the conflicting inference is false. And this is the standpoint from which our critics who are not Catholics should be invited to regard the new Syllabus.

They may themselves disbelieve altogether in Catholicism, but they should ask themselves if the propositions proscribed in the new Syllabus do not form a whole which is manifestly irreconcilable with the most fundamental doctrines of Catholicism, as they have always understood it, indeed, in many particulars, irreconcilable with the fundamental doctrines of what is popularly called orthodox Christianity? And if so, is it surprising that the Holy See should condemn them; or, to put it otherwise, would they themselves consider a man consistent who should profess to hold these propositions and at the same time declare that he held the Catholic Faith?

To Catholics this mode of regarding the new Syllabus may likewise be recommended, for the Church when she teaches with authority does not wish to suppress, but on the contrary to stimulate, the natural processes of the human mind; and says in effect, "Study carefully and without prejudice the propositions I have proscribed for you that you may be able to see for yourselves that in proscribing them I have only set you on the path of truth." And, in the present instance, now that the Holy Office has brought all these propositions together, and enabled us to see in them what they purport to be, an interpretation of the general scheme of Catholic faith and practice, can we, whilst recognizing in the Syllabus a fair and singularly moderate statement of some well-known theories, help feeling that the interpretation is one which is quite irreconcilable with Catholicism as we received it from our forefathers and find it in our past history, and one which, so far from justifying, undermines and discredits the whole tone and character of our spiritual life? We should like to confirm from the text of the Syllabus what we are here suggesting for consideration, did time and space permit; but we are supposing that our readers have seen it, and have noted how many things it omits of what antecedently we might have expected to find in it, for instance, the matter of the recent decisions of the Biblical Commission.

This, however, though a useful one, is not the primary aspect under which, as Catholics, we must accept this new document. Through a thousand channels the motives of credibility which confirm us in our faith, are daily outpouring themselves into our Christian experience. They are so many reasons bidding us look for guidance in our studies to the indefectible voice of Peter, which once more resounds through the world, and saves those who will listen to it from wasting their energies on paths which lead to no solutions.

The Garibaldi Centenary.

RARELY can two journals have found themselves in a more unpleasant predicament than those eminently representative newspapers, the *Times* and the *Daily News*, when in May, 1864, they ventured to call Cardinal Wiseman over the coals for certain comments of his on the subject of General Garibaldi. It will be remembered that in the April of that year Garibaldi had paid his famous visit to England, and had been received with the most extravagant demonstrations of popular favour in which not only Cabinet Ministers, but the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church took a prominent part. Shortly afterwards Cardinal Wiseman, in one of his Pastorals, called attention to the growing indifferentism and decay of faith of which such a reception was the sure indication. He pointed out that only a short time before, Garibaldi, in an open letter expressly directed to the English people, had identified himself with the anti-religious principles of the French Revolution, and had expressed regret that those principles had not enjoyed a more lasting triumph. In support of this the Cardinal quoted Garibaldi's own words, written a year and a half earlier.¹

The initiative that to-day belongs to you [the English nation] might not be yours to-morrow. May God avert this! Who more bravely took the initiative than France in '89? She who in that solemn moment gave to the world the Goddess Reason, levelled tyranny to the dust, and consecrated free brotherhood between nations. After almost a century she is reduced to combat the liberty of nations, to protect tyranny, and to direct her efforts to steady, on the ruins of the temple of Reason, that hideous immoral monstrosity—the Papacy. Rise therefore, O Britannia, and lose no time. Rise with uplifted brow and point out to other nations the road to follow, &c.

After quoting this passage in his Pastoral the Cardinal went on :

The representation by an act of sacrilegious solemnity of the victory of reason over revelation, was thus eulogized in an address to the

¹ The letter was published in the *Times*, October 3, 1862. It is dated Varignano, September 28th.

British nation by a man to whom it was said that English ladies knelt. Be it so. The French nation is extolled (by him) for that obscene worship, and is reprobated for having repented. . . . (In the general acclaim to him), not in the common crowd, not mingled with dissenting ministers . . . but standing apart, elaborately separated, were the leaders, we will not say the representatives, of the Anglican Hierarchy. Three, and three from each highest class,¹ the National Hierarchy came forward . . . to greet the man who has preached to them these doctrines and applauded to them these practices.

Oh, pity, pity, at least, if not worse, that such a spectacle should have been exhibited to England at the time, the moment when every energy on every hand should be put forth not to dally with but to crush the spirit of infidelity as well as disloyalty.²

Upon this Pastoral the *Daily News*, the *Globe*, and the *Times* all commented, charging the Cardinal with garbling Garibaldi's letter to suit his purpose. The *Daily News* said :

He [Cardinal Wiseman] has furnished bigoted Protestants with another striking instance of that dogmatic weakness of garbling texts and falsifying evidence and dressing up odious inventions. . . . We cannot find the words, "the Goddess Reason" or the "ruins of the Temple of Reason" in any part of the address.

The *Times*, relying on the *Daily News*, remarked somewhat more guardedly that these words "are said not to be found in the translation of his address," but went on none the less to declare that the Cardinal "inserts a word or two to make it suit his purpose, and then feigns a transport of pious horror at our impiety in doing honour to such a reprobate," and it concluded in the *Times'* most superior manner with the comment :

To us the invention of such profanities to damage a political enemy seems quite as shocking as the honest utterance of them ; but then our Goddess, as the Cardinal would call it, is not dogmatic orthodoxy but Truth.

A few days later the *Times* found itself in the painful position of having to withdraw and apologize. It was pointed out that the Cardinal's quotation was actually taken from the translation which had appeared in its own columns, while it also became manifest that when Garibaldi's address to the English people was issued in 1862, the *Daily News*, the good friend of Radicals and Revolutionaries, finding certain expressions which

¹ The Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin were all present.—H.T.

² See the admirable account in Wilfrid Ward's *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, ii. p. 469, and *Dublin Review*, July, 1864, p. 136.

might not be to the taste of all its readers, had quietly suppressed them. Never was a journal more completely "hoist with its own petard." As Mr. Wilfrid Ward effectively says :

The episode was a considerable moral victory for the Cardinal. Not only was the attack on him withdrawn, but the tables were turned. Wiseman had been accused of garbling his quotation to blacken an enemy ; Garibaldi's English supporters were convicted of garbling to whitewash him. The fact was brought to light that Englishmen were so ashamed of the language of the man they were idolizing, that they had suppressed it in their translations.

And now that under the pretext of Garibaldi's centenary, and with the effective support of Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's glowing panegyric,¹ a spasmodic attempt is being made to rekindle the enthusiasm of forty years ago, we may ask ourselves whether or no Cardinal Wiseman's estimate of Garibaldi as the foe of religion and order was a just one. The *Times*, in the article of May 31, 1864, in which it offered an *amende* to the Cardinal for its previous comments, strove to leave the impression that Garibaldi's words represented merely the unlucky exaggeration of a fit of ill-temper, not any deliberate conviction.

We can hardly doubt [ran the concluding sentence of the *Times*] that the General himself, if he could now revise this strange rhapsody, would withdraw the offensive contrast between the idolatry of Reason and the Papacy, as freely as we do the imputation upon the Cardinal's good faith.

Be it said in fairness to our opponents that this was no doubt the honest belief of the vast majority of the Englishmen of that day who welcomed Garibaldi with such demonstrations of esteem. It was certainly the view of Mr. Gladstone, though he had far more ample opportunities of acquainting himself with the true Garibaldi than almost any one else of his contemporaries. It was also presumably the view of Lord Acton (then Sir John Acton), who just a week after the appearance of the last number of the *Home and Foreign Review*, accepted Sir Anthony Panizzi's invitation to meet Garibaldi at a select dinner party given by Sir Anthony in the General's honour.²

¹ G. M. Trevelyan's *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*. London : Longmans. 1907.

² See Fagan's *Life of Panizzi*, who gives a list of the guests. One of these, strange to say, was Lord Frederick Cavendish. In the *Home and Foreign Review* Acton does not appear as a great admirer of Garibaldi. Under the heading

Moreover, there can be little doubt that Garibaldi during the time of his English visit was doing much violence to himself to fall in with the estimate which his English friends had formed of him. The outbursts of revolutionary fury and anti-clerical fanaticism which were characteristic of him elsewhere were for the time being held in check, though not, as the discerning reader of Guérzoni and other privileged biographers will remark, without a very considerable effort.

As for Mr. Gladstone's attitude we may learn much from a letter written by him at this period and quoted by his biographer¹ at some length. A friend who is not named had apparently addressed a letter to Gladstone expressing some surprise at the favour shown to a man of Garibaldi's anti-religious views.

The honour paid him [answered Mr. Gladstone] was, I think, his due as a most singularly simple, disinterested, and heroic character, who had achieved great things for Italy, for liberty well understood, and even for mankind. His insurrection we knew and lamented, and treated as exceptional. No Mazzinian leanings of his were known. I read the speech at the luncheon with surprise and concern. [Mr. Morley here interpolates in a footnote "speech undiscoverable by me." It is plain enough, I venture to think, what speech must be meant; but to this we will return immediately.] As to his attenuated belief I view it with the deepest sorrow and concern. I need not repeat an opinion always painful to me to pronounce, as to the principal causes to which it is referable and as to the chief seat of the responsibility for it. As to his Goddess Reason I understand by it simply an adoption of what are called on the Continent the principles of the French Revolution. These we neither want nor warmly relish in England, but they are different from its excesses, and the words will bear an innocent and even in some respects a beneficial meaning.

And now what about the speech at the luncheon which Mr. Gladstone had read "with surprise and concern"? In spite of all the efforts of General Garibaldi's friends to keep him from committing indiscretions during his stay in England, he had hardly set foot on English soil before he compromised them all very seriously. Before coming to London, and while he was still the guest of Mr. Seeley, M.P., in the Isle of Wight, Garibaldi insisted, the day after his arrival, in sending for

"Current Events" (vol. i. p. 275), we read of "the childish vanity and affectation of Garibaldi's missive to the Chamber;" and again (vol. i. p. 591), of "the display of Garibaldi's political incompetency which supplied the measure of his powers." These notices appeared in 1862.

¹ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, vol. ii. p. 111.

Mazzini to come and see him. Mazzini came at once, and Garibaldi embraced him affectionately and had a long private talk with him.¹ A few days later, when Garibaldi was in London, he disappeared one fine Sunday morning from the ken of the journalists who sedulously kept watch on his every movement. It was announced, and the newspapers repeated,² that he had gone for a drive with no other object than recreation, but shortly afterwards it leaked out that Garibaldi had really driven to Teddington to attend a luncheon party given in his honour by Alexander Herzen, the Russian revolutionary, and including Mazzini, Saffi (ex-Triumvir of the Roman Republic), and a number of other gentlemen of like sympathies. In the course of the luncheon Mazzini proposed the health of their visitor, and Garibaldi in replying used the following words:

I am about to make a declaration which I ought to have made long ago. There is a man amongst us here who has rendered the greatest services to our country, and to the cause of liberty. When I was a young man, having nought but aspirations towards the good, I sought for one able to act as the guide and counsellor of my young years. I sought such a man, even as he who is athirst seeks the spring, and at last I found him. He alone watched when all around him slept. He alone fed the sacred flame. He alone has ever remained unfalteringly loyal—ever full of love for his country, and of devotion to the cause of liberty. That man is my friend and teacher (*il mio amico e maestro*), Giuseppe Mazzini. Let us drink to his health.³

Now I am far from wishing to depict Mazzini as a mere vulgar assassin, or even as a desperado and a fanatic. No doubt in private life he had many amiable qualities. But even his apologists and admirers, like Mr. Bolton King, do not deny that he provided Gallenga with the means of executing his design of assassinating Charles Albert in revenge for the Genoese execu-

¹ Guerzoni, who was one of Garibaldi's suite, says that he received Mazzini "che il Generale stesso aveva desiderato vedere prima del suo arrivo in Londra, con quale s'abbracciava affettuosamente e restava in lungo segreto colloquio." (Guerzoni, *Vita di Garibaldi*, ii. 352.)

² In the *Guardian*, for example (April 27th, 1864), which I quote in preference to others as I happen to have it at hand, the statement occurs, p. 392: "We were mistaken in saying last week that Garibaldi's visit to Teddington on the previous Sunday had no other object than recreation." After which follows an account of the luncheon and of the Mazzini speech.

³ This speech is given by Guerzoni in French; by Augusto Elia, *Ricordi di uno Garibaldino dal 1847 al 1900* (Rome, 1904, ii. 173), in Italian; by the English newspapers in English, but all the versions substantially agree.

tions, and that he sent him a dagger for that express purpose.¹ Moreover, Mazzini, though he sheltered his views behind many conditions and qualifications, never unequivocally condemned but rather defended the lawfulness of political assassination. For the average Englishman it is impossible to distinguish between these ideas and those which were invoked by a certain extreme section of the Irish Nationalists to justify such crimes as the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke. If these theories are propagated by a man with a refined face, gentle manners, and a delicate taste in literature, rather than by a swaggering bravo with a pistol in his belt, this does not make them less but more dangerous. Moreover, only a week before Garibaldi's arrival, Mazzini had been condemned, I do not pretend to say how far justly or unjustly, by the Assize Court of Paris to penal servitude for conspiring against the Emperor.² Mazzini, of course, was absent, and did not plead, but the court professed to arrive at its decision only after strict inquiry. Such definite facts as these can be little affected by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's conviction that Mazzini was a saint, a conviction which seems to be chiefly substantiated by the sense of his "divine" appearance as recorded by one of his lady admirers.³

His was the domination not of supreme efficiency and egoism, but of an almost superhuman virtue, of an other-worldliness which long years of suffering and self-surrender had suffused through his being, so that those who looked on him and heard his voice were compelled to reverence the divine in man. While Garibaldi was being fashioned into a hero on the breezy uplands of Brazil, the more painful making of a saint had for eleven years been in process amid the squalid and fog-obscured surroundings of a London lodging-house. And now at last the finished product of so much pain and virtue shone before Europe in Italian sunlight, on the great stage of Rome.⁴

It is a little disconcerting after soaring into this heavenly atmosphere, which almost reminds one of Marie Corelli at her

¹ Bolton King, *Life of Mazzini*, p. 166.

² Whether Mazzini had anything to do with the Orsini bomb outrage I do not pretend to decide, but Mr. Bolton King admits that "he commissioned Orsini to find men to surprise and kill the Austrian officers at Milan as the first step towards an insurrection." What, on similar principles, would prevent a hot-headed Irish patriot from believing that to shake off the yoke of the Saxon invader he was justified in hiring men to surprise and kill the Lord Lieutenant and the officials of Dublin Castle.

³ "Last night," wrote Margaret Fuller, "I heard a ring; then somebody spoke my name; the voice struck me at once. He looks more divine than ever, after his new strange sufferings." (Quoted by Mr. Trevelyan, p. 93.)

⁴ Trevelyan, *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*, p. 97.

best, to turn to the Index of the same volume, and under the heading "Mazzini, Giuseppe," to observe such entries as the following :

Quarrel with Garibaldi (p. 50). . . Quarrels with Garibaldi (p. 135). . . Quarrel with Garibaldi over captured bastions (p. 208). Renewed quarrel (p. 214). Refuses to join him in leaving Rome (p. 228).

It is even more disconcerting to find this saintly man, according to the unsuspected testimony of his panegyrist, Mr. Bolton King, advising his followers to "shout for Pio Nono louder than the rest," while at the same time outside of Italy they were to "depreciate the Pope with equal vehemency;"¹ or again, for his own purposes, "making a disingenuous use" of the proclamations of Kossuth by interpolating passages which were not in the original.²

But we are travelling a long way from Mr. Gladstone's letter. Saint or no saint, it evidently caused that statesman both surprise and concern to hear the avowal of Garibaldi's relation to the notorious conspirator. When he declares in the past tense that "no Mazzinian leanings of his (Garibaldi's) were known," he evidently implies that if they had been known the welcome to the hero of Caprera would not have been so cordial. Hence, no doubt, it happened that every effort was made to keep the Mazzini luncheon out of the newspapers. Hence again it was that Mr. Louis Fagan was mysteriously sent by Panizzi (who by the way was also not on speaking terms with the saintly Mazzini, though he had once been his intimate friend), at five o'clock in the morning to deliver a note into Mazzini's own hands.³ It looks, I fear, as if Sir Anthony was not particularly anxious to be known to hold communication with his whilom associate. It was indeed to Panizzi that Massimo d'Azeglio, another witness not to be suspected of clericalism, addressed his singularly vigorous protest against the reception accorded to Garibaldi in England. After speaking appreciatively of the General's honesty and courage he remarks that his followers

¹ Bolton King, *Mazzini*, p. 113. Even Mr. King has the grace to characterize this as "underhand diplomacy."

² Mr. King gives references to *Daily News*, February 19, March 2, and March 4, 1853; and though he remarks in the text that it is not clear that the alterations in Kossuth's text were due to Mazzini, he adds in the note: "I fear that no other conclusion is possible." Neither was this the only instance.

³ Fagan, *Life of Sir Anthony Panizzi*, i. p. 186. Cf. another mysteriously early visit, *ibid.* ii. p. 250.

had, however, "intoxicated him with an amount of incense and adulation which would have turned the head of a bronze horse, much more Garibaldi's," and then he goes on :

Let us now turn to the English people. Garibaldi went to them with the harbinger of a fantastic legend such as no one ever had before. I should have thought it natural for him to be received, applauded, exalted, clubbified, and dined by the whole population, including the Italians in London. But that a man who boasted of superiority to the laws, a man still reeking with the blood of Italian soldiers whom he had slain, should be officially received by the State, by Parliament, by the Ministers, by the heir of the English throne, with honours never accorded to any sovereign, . . . and this while he who was thus welcomed was the declared friend of Mazzini, who, could he have got the chance, would have had all such personages hanged, that this should have happened amongst a people that thinks it has a mission to preserve intact the idea of truth, of justice, and of honour, must be bitterly deplored by every one of sound common sense, and I cannot persuade myself that you think differently.¹

It would serve no useful purpose to revive the old discussion why Garibaldi's visit to this country terminated so abruptly. After the explicit assurances given by Mr. Gladstone and Lord Shaftesbury, that the suggestion of his departure did not originate with the Government, it seems fairly clear that Garibaldi, having received or suspected some hint that his intercourse with refugees of the type of Mazzini, Louis Blanc, Ledru Rollin and the rest, was not regarded with favour,² flared up and declared he would relieve the Ministry of his presence altogether. However, he was with some little difficulty prevailed upon to keep up a certain appearance of cordiality to the last, and to smooth his ruffled dignity the Prince of Wales himself came to see him on the day before his departure. What interests us more immediately, is the question of his attitude towards revolutionary principles. Were Mr. Gladstone and the *Times* justified in treating his grandiloquent invocation of the Goddess of Reason as a mere idle verbiage? Now there is a curious document which was openly published under Garibaldi's name in 1879, and which, it seems to me, will afford considerable assistance in replying to this question. It is entitled *Pensées Anti-Cléricales*, and it is printed as an introduction to a very scurrilous romance of the now notorious

¹ Massimo d'Azeglio to Panizzi. *Life*, ii. p. 253.

² It is also possible, and was said at the time, that the Queen had expressed herself strongly.

Léo Taxil. Even in 1879, when this novel, *Le Fils du Jésuite*, was published, Léo Taxil had acquired a certain infamous celebrity. He was founder and editor of a journal, *Le Anti-Clérical*, in which shameless attacks on religion in every form alternated with gross indecency. Moreover, at the office of this review he had established a *Librairie Anti-Cléricale*, which provided a large supply of books of this class in a cheap and popular form. *Le Fils du Jésuite* is, of course, a novel in which all the clergy who appear on the scene are represented as monsters of treachery, vindictiveness, and debauchery. On the first vacant page of this estimable work we find the following dedication :

A CELUI QUE J'AFFECTIONNE COMME UN PÈRE

À GARIBALDI

JE DÉDIE CE LIVRE

LÉO TAXIL.

Then we have the *Pensées Anti-Cléricales*, which are signed by the General himself. They begin as follows :

The Scriptures, which idiots and rogues (*les stupides et les fourbes*) are wont to call holy or sacred, place beside the first human couple, the serpent, who takes advantage of the weakness of the first woman to effect her ruin.

This beautiful fable¹ would have been greatly improved, if the reptile had been replaced by a priest. For it is the priest who is the true personification of malice and mendacity. He is far better equipped for corruption and treachery than the loathsome and tortuous denizen of the marshes.

When a priest, and above all a Jesuit, the quintessence of the priest —presents himself to my view, all the ugliness of his nature strikes me so forcibly as to give me the shudders and produce a fit of nausea.²

Or again a little further on :

It is only through Jesuitism that tyranny can live. When will the face of the earth be rid of this sect, infamous, criminal, abominable, which prostitutes, enervates, and brutalizes mankind.

¹ *Cette belle fable.* I have no doubt that this is said ironically and that we ought really to translate "this precious nonsense," but let us give the General the benefit of the doubt.

² P. vii.

And the people still go to Mass, to Vespers, confess, communicate, kiss the hand of these pestiferous wretches from hell. It is upon this foundation that the power of tyranny is built. The blush of shame rises to my brow when I reflect that I am a member of that imbecile crowd whom we are not ashamed to call civilized humanity. . . .

Let us note and deplore the fact that the priest's most powerful ally is woman.

Woman! the most perfect of creatures when she is good, but a very demon when she allows herself to be ruled by the seducers and traitors of nations, by these beings with souls of mire, by these shavelings.¹

Or again :

Liberty, in my opinion, ought not to exist for mosquitos, for reptiles, for assassins, for thieves, for despots—neither ought it to exist for priests, who are just as dangerous as these.²

There is much more to the same effect. The only other extract I propose to make had better be given in French, for I am not quite sure of its precise meaning.

Quand je songe au pouvoir conservé par les prêtres dans ce siècle qui se dit le siècle des lumières, je me prends à douter que ces crétins, dont les formes ressemblent aux miennes, soient réellement des hommes. Ils me paraissent plutôt une de ces tribus de singes comme j'en ai vus dans le Nouveau-Monde.³

Presumably the *crétins* must be the priests, but on the other hand logic and the context seem to suggest that it is his fellow-men whom the writer characterizes as apes and less than human, because they tolerate priestly domination.

The copy from which I am quoting is to be found in the British Museum Library.⁴ It professes to be the eighth edition, and bears the date 1879. As the book first appeared in that year, the editions must have sold out quickly. Upon the covers of the volume the publications of the *Bibliothèque Anti-Cléricale* are largely advertised. The titles leave no doubt as to their contents. Among the brochures costing 60 centimes, and sent by post for 70 centimes, from the bureau of the *Librairie* we may notice such works as these—*Écrasons l'Infâme*, par Voltaire ;—*À bas la Calotte !* par Taxil ;—*Les Debauches d'un Confesseur* ;—*Les Galanteries de la Bible* ;—*Les Bêtises Sacrées*. Or, again, we find displayed conspicuously an advertisement of what we might

¹ P. x. xi.

² P. xiv.

³ P. xii.

⁴ 12511, u. 2.

call without much exaggeration the most degrading book ever published by a man of genius, *La Pucelle de Voltaire*.¹

But, it will be said, the fact that M. Léo Taxil dedicated one of his books to Garibaldi, and published some of the General's most violent utterances as a Preface, does not in any way compromise Garibaldi himself. No doubt this is true, and if the matter rested there, we might, knowing M. Taxil's character, legitimately feel some hesitation about believing that Garibaldi ever wrote anything of the nature imputed to him. But as it happens, we have evidence that more than a year after the publication of this volume the hero of Caprera was on very friendly if not intimate terms with Taxil. In the Italian edition of Garibaldi's letters published in 1885 after his death, two letters are included addressed to Taxil. No doubt we should never have seen these if Taxil's quarrel with the Freemasons and his "conversion" to Catholicity had taken place earlier, but in the first part of 1885 he was still regarded as a sound anticlerical. Accordingly, on March 9, 1882, we find Garibaldi writing a letter from Naples beginning, "*Mio carissimo Leone Taxil*," and commenting with the General's usual violence upon the progress of the French war in Tunis.

My very dear Leo Taxil [he writes], it is all over. Your priest-ridden Republic will never deceive anybody again. The love and veneration I formerly bore it have turned into contempt. Your war in Tunis is a disgrace. . . . Your precious generals who allowed themselves to be carted off in cattle trucks to Germany after abandoning half a million of brave soldiers to the enemy, are now rhodomontading and dragooning among the poor harmless natives of Tunis who owe them nothing and have never done them any harm. . . .²

The authenticity of this letter is further guaranteed by the fact that it was afterwards appealed to in a vain attempt to vindicate M. Léo Taxil's respectability before the law courts³ in one of the numerous prosecutions brought against him for his libellous and indecent publications.

And here a further word may be said in passing upon

¹ The advertisement runs thus: "LA PUCELLE, Ouvrage célèbre de Voltaire—Tel qu'il est dans notre édition anti-cléricale, c'est à dire *sans aucune coupure* [italics in original], cet ouvrage n'a plus été imprimé depuis au moins cent ans. Il est aussi complet que dans l'édition authentique de Voltaire, dont les exemplaires n'existent plus que dans les bibliothèques d'amateurs."

² *Epistolario di Giuseppe Garibaldi*. Milano: 1885. Vol. ii. pp. 329-330.

³ Léo Taxil's counsel said: "Cette lettre de Garibaldi témoigne d'une grande intimité entre Léo Taxil et l'illustre patriote."

M. Taxil's career. Thanks to the fact that he was ostensibly "converted," and went over to the clericals in 1885, such authorities as Larousse and Vapereau, who will not be suspected of clerical leanings, speak of him with exceeding frankness.

M. G. A. Jogand Pagès, *alias* Léo Taxil, was born at Marseilles in 1854, and, it is stated, was at one time a pupil of the Jesuits, though he had also been in a reformatory at Mettray. Before he was twenty-five he had founded the *Anti-Clérical*, and his books had a certain vogue for their audacious attacks on religion and their indecency, though, says Larousse, they showed no signs of literary talent.¹ He was prosecuted and sentenced to heavy fines half a dozen times over before his so-called conversion in 1885. In 1881, for example, earlier than the date of the letter just quoted, he was condemned to pay 4,000 francs for appropriating the literary work of another author lately deceased and publishing it as his own. A little later he had to pay 3,000 francs and to undergo fifteen days' imprisonment for the obscene engravings which adorned his work, *La Prostitution Contemporaine*. Similarly for his atrocious book, *Les Amours de Pie IX.*, Taxil was sentenced to 60,000 francs damages at the suit of Count Mastai, the nephew of the deceased Pontiff. He also published a *Vie de Jésus*² (1884) with "nearly five hundred comic illustrations." The humiliating story of his pretended conversion in 1885, of his Masonic revelations, and of the portentous hoax of Diana Vaughan, will be fresh in the memory of most of my readers. This was the man whom in 1882 Garibaldi greeted as "*Mio carissimo Leone Taxil*," after having previously in 1879 given substantial proof, as we have seen, of his hearty sympathy with the Anti-clerical Library.

¹ As an example of the language of the *Anti-Clérical* before the death of Garibaldi, I take the following. The British Museum chanced to possess a copy of the *Procès des Congrégations contre Léo Taxil*, and I have taken the trouble to cast my eye through it. It would be impossible to reproduce here the more disgusting portions of the article in the *Anti-Clérical* for which M. Taxil was prosecuted, and it was only one among scores of such. It must be sufficient to state that the title was, *Pourritures Congréganistes*, and to quote such a passage as the following. "Ces misérables" (*i.e.*, the teachers of Marseilles belonging to the male religious orders) "ont toutes les passions bestiales." . . . "Du premier jusqu'au dernier, les instituteurs congréganistes sont tous des monstres; les découvertes qui se font chaque jour sur leurs mœurs épouvantables, autorisent à penser et à dire qu'il n'y a pas une seule exception dans ces associations d'êtres vicieux." In this case Taxil was fined 12,000 francs.

² An advertisement which appears on the cover of another volume of the *Bibliothèque Anti-Cléricale*, describes the book thus: "*La Vie de Jésus*. Par Léo Taxil. Ouvrage excessivement beau avec près de 500 dessins comiques par Pepin. 5 francs."

Now I do not for a moment suggest that Garibaldi bears any sort of resemblance to Léo Taxil, but it is surely a fair inference that the General, in spite of his incessant rhodomontades about justice, and patriotism and virtue, was absolutely indifferent to the moral character of his associates.¹ Provided that a man possessed the essential qualification of a bitter hatred of priests and the Papacy, no instrument was too vile to be used in reviling the clergy and discrediting them with the people. Judged by all standards of law and tradition, no man's acts needed more benignant interpretation than Garibaldi's own. Consistency was a consideration which obviously troubled him but little. He, the buccaneer, the revolutionary, whose sole defence against a charge of piracy, bloodshed, and robbery lay in a feeble plea of good intentions, makes no difficulty in railing with even more than his usual violence against the iniquity of that "maxim of the Jesuits"—the end justifies the means.² And so again, while he denounces Rome as the *lupanar* from which flowed all the profligacy of Europe, and while he returns again and again to the cry of clerical debauchery, he lends his support to an undertaking like the *bibliothèque anti-cléricale*, in which the most shameless pornography runs rampant in every advertisement. Whatever may be our appreciation for Garibaldi's courage or determination, and for a certain rugged honesty and simplicity which went with his violence, the fierce spirit of fanaticism which possessed him rendered him an absolutely incongruous element in any kind of civilized life. The only position that he could fill was that of dictator, and the moment the crisis was over his exercise of that office was attended with so much friction on every side that his rule became impracticable in the last degree.

Nothing could more convincingly prove the very ordinary clay of which Garibaldi was made, than the history of his intervention in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, and to this I propose to devote the remainder of my space. He who has not studied the behaviour of the freebooter of Caprera in

¹ Bordone, the chief of Garibaldi's staff in the campaign of 1870-1871, whom Gambetta and de Freycinet were compelled by Garibaldi to raise, very reluctantly, to the rank of General, had three times been sentenced by the French courts only a few years before, once to two months prison and 50 francs fine for swindling (*pour escroquerie*). See the *Journal Officiel*, 1871, no. 112, p. 721.

² "La fin justifie les moyens. Telle est la maxime des Jésuites, de cette secte qui n'aspire qu'à abrutir et à asservir tout homme vivant en dehors d'elle. Mesurez en tout l'effroyable cynisme et vous aurez une idée de leur puissance pour le mal." (*Pensées Anti-Cléricales.*)

his campaign with the army of the Vosges, does not know Garibaldi. Fortunately, we are not dealing here with the highly-embroidered legends of enthusiastic admirers, for the most part recorded long after the event, and absolutely uncontrollable by official reports or statistics of any sort. This is the material out of which Mr. Trevelyan has manufactured his highly ornate panegyric. But the figure that he has evolved is a very different personage from the incompetent, bombastic, and most unheroic character who stands before us in the pages of M. Perrot's *Rapport*, the outcome of the official inquiry ordered by the French Chamber after the War. And the latter account is substantiated at every turn by the text of official despatches, hard facts which no imaginative colouring can do away with or substantially modify.

Let me take as the first illustration of Garibaldi's incompetence in any post of authority needing tact and a knowledge of men, the same anti-clerical fanaticism of which we have already spoken. In his somewhat ill-defined command of the army of the Vosges, Garibaldi had under his orders a body of troops largely drawn from the French peasantry in districts which were by no means irreligious, and officered by men who as a body were certainly not less Catholic than the pupils of St. Cyr and Vaugirard, who, thirty years later, rent France almost in twain over the *affaire* Dreyfus. Moreover, a thousand circumstances must have brought home to Garibaldi the supreme importance of cordial co-operation with the other generals in high command like Bourbaki and Pelissier, and must have allowed him to feel that the mere fact of the Italian origin of his staff, and of a large portion of his troops, was likely to lead to sensitiveness and friction. None the less, at the very crisis of the struggle, Garibaldi thought well to issue a proclamation to the troops containing such phrases as these :

GARIBALDI TO THE ARMY OF THE VOSGES, JAN. 18, 1871.

The formidable soldiers of the King of Prussia, erstwhile so proud when fighting against a tyrant [*i.e.* Napoleon III.], now begin to give way before the noble champions of right and justice, and it is for you, favoured sons of fortune, that the task has been reserved, not only of sweeping the invader from the soil of your beautiful country, but of building up upon solid foundations the sacred principles of the liberty and fraternity of nations, which twenty centuries and the efforts of all past generations have not been able to secure, owing to the tenacious and diabolical combination of the tyrant and the priest. . . .

Lies and corruption are the emblems of these evil doers, truth and justice are written on the banners of your young legions, and the blood, the tears, the desolation of two great nations deceived and betrayed, have brought forth this new era, in which the human family will learn to forget the blood-stained pages, written upon with the sword and with the censer, bearing the imprint of the Empire and of that black reptile which serves as its pedestal.¹

It can hardly need to be pointed out that by this "black reptile," Garibaldi plainly indicated his special bugbear, the Catholic priesthood. One does not require to be an expert in military tactics to tell that in the desperate straits in which France then found herself, proclamations such as these, which tended to create the bitterest resentments among her feeble defenders, must be counted as rank lunacy. Nor was this by any means the only occasion upon which Garibaldi indulged in the same gratuitous insults to the religious convictions of half the men he was commanding. For instance, much earlier than this, Garibaldi had issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of the Côte d'Or, headed as usual, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, in which he told them that they might drive the enemy out of their country in twenty days, but, he added,

It is useless to think of it if you put any confidence in the words of the priest, a man who is without country, and who already is paying his court to William, the new head of the Holy Empire, the representative of the old canting watchword, "throne and altar," that is to say, the chief of all impostors and brigands.

I have illustrated, I think, in some measure the fanatical attitude of Garibaldi towards Catholicism. As to his own religious convictions, he sometimes, as Mr. Trevelyan points out, called himself an atheist;² sometimes in his speeches and manifestoes he shrouded himself in a sort of nebulous Christianity. It was largely a matter of mood or expediency. A pious Scottish visitor who was eager to get a number of autographs from Garibaldi at a moment when the latter was not disposed to be interrupted, was told—no doubt it was the first lie that occurred to them as likely to quiet the intruder—that the hero could not possibly be disturbed because he was reading his Bible.³ One can imagine the shouts of laughter

¹ *Enquête Parlementaire sur les Actes du Gouvernement de la Défense Nationale. Rapport de M. Perrot*, vol. vii. p. 692. The death of M. Perrot prevented an accurate revision of some of these documents, and there are one or two obvious misprints in the text from which I quote, e.g., *pays* is printed for *pages*, &c.

² Trevelyan, p. 99.

³ MacGrigor, *Garibaldi at Home*, p. 150.

with which the record of this remarkable religious development would have been received, if ever they read it, by the Garibaldi household.

The same obtuse but honest Scot, however, was obviously shocked at the fierce intolerance of Garibaldi's opinions on Popery, and he found that he made no exception for Roman ecclesiastics in England. There would have been short shrift for all alike if Garibaldi had had his way.¹

Of the other aspects of Garibaldi's campaign in France I have unfortunately left myself little room to speak. The reader who will study M. Perrot's report with its huge collection of illustrative despatches will be confronted with as pitiable an exhibition of human pettiness and incapacity as it would be possible to find. Though Garibaldi was the *Deus ex machina* invoked by M. de Freycinet and M. Gambetta, and favoured in every way, they found him and his Italian staff, notably Bordone, impossible people to deal with. Such unsuspected witnesses as M. Challemel Lacour complained that the Italian contingent was a perfect scourge to the country and prayed to be delivered from them.² The Italian commanders were always making difficulties, always full of childish jealousies, always greedy for money and authority.³ Garibaldi, be it said in his excuse, was ill during a part of the campaign, and so utterly lacking in initiative that a quite friendly member of his staff, Gauckler, telegraphing to Gambetta, thought it would be necessary to supersede him.⁴ As regards the military operations, the very grave charge rests upon

¹ "Believing that priestly encroachment was making progress in England unheeded, Garibaldi expressed to me his opinion of the treatment which certain foreign dignitaries residing among us deserved. I remarked to him that England was a land of liberty and toleration, but he answered that to give liberty to these men was the same as giving liberty to thieves in one's own house." (MacGrigor, *Garibaldi at Home*, p. 161.) By "foreign dignitaries" must clearly be meant Englishmen, like Cardinal Wiseman, enjoying Roman titles. No other foreign dignitaries were then residing in England.

² *Enquête, Rapport de M. Perrot*, viii. 487 and elsewhere.

³ For example, de Freycinet writes to General Bordone, Jan. 19, 1871: "Je ne comprends pas les incessantes questions que vous me posez pour savoir qui commande." "You are the only people who are eternally making difficulties," he says elsewhere. (*Enquête Parlementaire sur les actes du Gouvernement de la Defense Nationale. Rapport de M. Perrot*, vol. vii. p. 704.)

⁴ In this Gauckler says: "Quand Bordone est absent, cet entourage (Garibaldi's Italian friends and relatives) commet au nom de Garibaldi des inepties et des turpitudes qui désorganisent et démoralisent l'armée," with much more to the same effect. (*Ibid.* p. 638.)

Garibaldi of having, by his inaction, and his persistent unwillingness either to obey instructions or to co-operate with the other French generals, allowed the army of Manteuffel to march past him without the slightest effective opposition, and in that way to cut the communications of General Bourbaki, rendering this latter commander's position an absolutely hopeless one. The Report of the Commission does not hesitate to speak in the very gravest terms of the negligence for which Garibaldi was responsible, and the Commissioners sum up by saying that if he had been a French General, it would have been their duty to recommend to the Ministry of War that he should be tried by Court Martial.¹ I may say that I have tested the French Commissioners' version of Garibaldi's responsibility for the loss of Bourbaki's army, the one hope of France at that juncture, by an examination of four of the most representative of the German narratives of the campaign.² So far as I can judge, the German authorities speak quite as strongly as the French, and attribute the principal share in the disaster which befell the army of the south to Garibaldi's fatal inaction and to his deplorable policy of playing for his own hand.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ "Si le général Garibaldi avait été un général français, nous aurions été contraints de vous demander que ce rapport et les pièces qui le justifient fussent renvoyés par l'Assemblée au ministère de la Guerre, afin d'examiner si le général Garibaldi ne devait pas être traduit devant un Conseil du guerre, pour y répondre de sa conduite, comme "ayant abandonné à l'ennemi, de propos délibéré et sans combat, des positions qu'il avait reçu mission de défendre; et comme ayant par là occasionné la perte d'une armée française et amené un désastre militaire qui n'aura de comparable dans l'histoire que les désastres de Sedan et de Metz."

² I refer to Von Moltke's *History of the Franco-German War* (Eng. Trans. 1893, pp. 371-372, and 380); Wartenleben's *Operations of the Southern Army*, which represents the first German Official History (Eng. Trans. 1872, pp. 31 and 39), Pflugk Hartung's General History, also translated into English, 1900, and Kech, *Das Leben des General Feldmarschals E. von Manteuffel*, 1890, pp. 202-203.

God's Orphan.

III.

I saw that every morning, far withdrawn
Beyond the darkness and the cataract,
God made Himself an awful rose of dawn.

WHEN Menandrión regained full consciousness after his sun-stroke, he found himself in a small bedroom, the window of which looked out upon sea.

During the long delirium, when he was aware of himself at all, he had felt, as it were, all brain, and wrapped in a sticky and stifling blackness; across a wave of sickly light the face of Lucian had seemed, from time to time, to slide. And now that it was the body that seemed leaden, and the head extraordinarily light and clear, as if washed by pure, cool water bubbling with brilliancy, still was it Lucian, sitting by the window, that made the first impression on Menandrión.

Half disgusted with his own sentiment, yet sorry for the smashing blow which had fallen on the lad, and which he had occasioned, Lucian had seen for a moment that when a man sets out to destroy, he cannot always regulate the kind of ruin he achieves; and when, on the night of the catastrophe, he had stumbled upon the priest lying drunk across the cabin steps, he had, by an impulse of real generosity, disembarked at Miletus with the unconscious boy, determined to see him through his illness before continuing his own journey, or at all events to deliver him from the care of Mithrobesches.

Menandrión did indeed make a quick but partial recovery. The cure affected the body, but somehow at first failed to reach the soul. Perhaps a modification of the brain tissue brought it about that though reasoning power survived, spiritual perception, if we may so call it, seemed killed. The death of this power was revealed chiefly by the corresponding death of the

soul in all external things; for, in its reaction upon this, the noblest spiritual activity had proved its own existence. As he grew stronger, Menandrion could watch the waves—sapphire, here too, with spray of diamonds—and the flowers and butterflies, and could draw great breaths of air in which sunlight danced. But colour and motion and light brought nothing with them: they remained noticeable facts, not much preferable to their absence; certainly not suggestive of a further reality, to be sought, seized, and rejoiced in. And, still more deadening, no *thought* brought meaning with it: when at last he could read, words and prayers—so sublime of old, and bringing about his soul that silence and aloofness in which took place things diviner still than prayer—became now just arrangements of symbols for eye and brain, falling into coherent wholes like glass in a kaleidoscope, but in no sense alive, or akin to his living soul, and demanding recognition. He did not feel sorry at this: he experienced a vague politeness, as it were, to these exterior facts, a willingness to attend to them when he was not too tired, but he owned to no personal relation due to them. In the same way he felt no longer any repulsion for Lucian, thinking coldly at times, no doubt, that he was coarse and rather unintelligible, but agreeing that it was suitable he should remain with him, as Lucian had suggested; and realizing that refusal would be not only churlish, but suicidal in his desolate poverty. For the one thought he would never admit was that of a return to the old life of an Isiac, at Smyrna or elsewhere. That the soul was really not dead was proved by its agonized reaction to this one stimulus. Lucian had been terrified by one violent attack of hysteria occasioned by his suggesting a return to Theon's temple; and the doctor had asserted that a relapse would definitely unbalance the boy's brain. But, in the curious airiness of head which Menandrion was now experiencing, he had no difficulty in turning his thoughts from any subject, from the religious aspect of the past or of his prospects, and the subject dropped.

But Lucian was burning to go on to Paphlagonia, where the doings of the mysterious Alexander were growing daily in notoriety. As he took Menandrion by easy stages northward, he related to him what information he had collected; and though the mention of Alexander seemed to provoke him to unusual violence and vulgarity—Menandrion wondered why anger should make Lucian coarsely talkative: in the old days,

when he had felt it, indignation had only made him the more silent—he seemed to have extracted the facts with sufficient accuracy.¹

"You will excuse my mentioning these things to an educated person like yourself," said Lucian, airily, and addressing in reality the imagined audience always around him, "but you may as well know what an Augean stable it is we have to sluice." And he developed the metaphor. . . . Then, "I shall write a few pages on the matter—not that the man deserves it; tearing in pieces by dogs and apes in the theatre, that's the proper advertisement for him! Well, a regular pest, he was; even as a brat: he toured as accomplice with a conjurer, and engineered the mystifications. Then he went into partnership with a Byzantine trickster called Cocconas, and when they saw that touring didn't really pay, they pitched on Paphlagonia, a place packed with fools, fatheads, and pious plutocrats," said Lucian explosively,² "people who stare and gape at any one who comes along with a flute or a drum or a pair of cymbals, and fall down and worship him. So they discovered (that's their way of putting it) a bronze tablet in the temple at Chalcedon, saying that Apollo and his son Asclepius were to take possession of the town Abonoteichus. Well, this got noised about, and when Alexander reached the place, would you believe it, he found a temple started, and the foundations laid, for the god who was to come! Just then Cocconas died, and so he had the field to himself. So one day he came leaping naked into the market-place, shouting and tossing his hair; sprang on to a platform and yelled out, 'O blessed city, so soon to receive the God made manifest.' And he poured out a jargon of Hebrew and Phœnician, and called on Apollo and Asclepius. Then off he dashes to the new buildings, jumps into a pool of rain-water, fishes out an egg, cracks it, and out wriggles a little snake! Asclepius! what more do you want? Asclepius the twice-born!³ Of course you follow me," said Lucian sharply to

¹ We will except the gossip about Alexander's morality, which is the regular stock-in-trade of this kind of pamphleteering, and indeed Alexander would appear (*Luc. Alex. Pseudomantis*, § 247) to have laid down one unusual and certainly unpopular practical doctrine.

² *παχέως*, he calls them, § 217.

³ The worship of gods and heroes and Asclepius in particular under the symbol of a snake is too familiar to require illustration; see, however, Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 341—3, 327—332, &c. The snake Alexander used in his representations may well have been the *Coelopeltis lacertina* described on p. 328, specimens of which over 6 ft. long are not uncommon.

Menandrión : "He blew a goose's egg, put the beast in, pasted it up, and buried it the night before?"

Menandrión nodded.

"Then he produced, in a few days, a bigger snake which he said was the god grown full-size; this I believe gives oracles: you don't know how much to credit. There's no doubt people hand him in papers, sealed and tied, and he returns them intact with the proper answer appended. I'll settle him, gods! Or he sleeps on the notes, and dreams the answer. He's tricked the whole Empire: he's stormed the Capitol. There's that purple old fool of a senator, Rutillianus, who's practically thrown up all his official position to marry the fellow's daughter—daughter of Alexander and the Moon, so please you, who fell in love with the prophet on her own account. It's rather a way she's got. . . . And in the big plague he sent round a charm: 'Phœbus unshorn of lock shall 'fend the cloud of plague.' And by a pretty chance, just those houses which put it on their door-posts came off worst. No doubt they thought that the hairy Phœbus would shoot away the pest, and so neglected ordinary precautions. Serve 'em right."

As they approached Abonoteichus, the signs of the prevalent cult became frequent. Shrines and street-corner statues showed the snake-god, with his name, Glykon, engraved above. Bodies of pilgrims were met, singing hymns, and in much excitement—brains and hearts, as Lucian said, rather mixing his metaphors, in such a simmering that they weren't like meat-eating mortals any more, but silly sheep, all of 'em, except to look at. Things had changed since the old days when Alexander sat in his little two-doored hut, trusting to the gloom to pass off his *mise-en-scène*, while the stream of peasants was hurried in by one door and out on the other side. Alexander lived now in the completed temple, and there, on the first day, the travellers twice had a glimpse of him. Once, within the shrine, the folding doors were flung wide, and the tall figure of the prophet, clothed in purple and white, with a white cloak, hair and beard shaggy upon breast and shoulders, was seen behind a barrier. Writhing round neck and arms was visible the body of a large snake; the head was concealed beneath the draperies. Just as Menandrión was leaving, a howl from the sweating, struggling mob made him look back. From beneath the prophet's beard a monstrous head protruded, a snake's head, yet with a hideous likeness to humanity; its mouth opened and shut; a forked

tongue flickered. A mellow voice chanted a phrase, though the prophet's lips never moved. But in the general hubbub, Menandrión missed the words.

That night a bewildering spectacle was witnessed. A ceremony of initiation, modelled, in its main lines, on that at Eleusis, was begun in the temple precincts. It lasted three days. A proclamation preceded it: "If any Atheist or Epicurean or Christian be come to spy on our mysteries, let him begone: but let the faithful of our God receive the rite with all good luck." The orthodox "expulsion" then took place. Alexander advanced shouting, "Out with the Christians;" the crowd answered, with a yell, "Out with the Epicureans." "He hates the Epicureans," explained Lucian, "because they're sensible people and show him up: he burnt all Epicurus' books the other day in the market. And he hates the Christians because they won't come to him, though they're as simple a set as any of these Paphlagonian snivellers."

"Why won't they come to him?" said Menandrión.

"Because they've a rival magician of their own, who was impaled in Palestine some time ago for heading an insurrection against the Jews, who were in a sort of permanent insurrection against everybody else. They're a morose set, but you can easily take 'em in by saying you want to learn their religion. I've done it."

A series of mythological dramas followed, acted in the symbolical style of the times. On the first day scenes connected with Apollo and Asclepius were shown: on the second, the birth and epiphany of Glykon: on the third, the history (revised) of Alexander, including his marriage with the Moon, who descended by a rope from the temple roof.¹

Before the display was over, Menandrión, overcome by the shouts of "Hail, Alexander!" reiterated by a reeling and leaping crowd redolent of garlic, had fainted, and Lucian had him taken back to their mean lodging. There for four days he nursed him, without however forgetting Alexander.

He sent, by his servant, several questions to the shrine,

¹ From Lucian's data, as by a caricature, we can check our knowledge of the salient features of the Eleusinian ritual. His details are, however, suspicious. There must surely have been some connection between Rutillia, the great lady of the Roman court, who played the part of the Moon, and Rutillianus, the senator who married the Moon's daughter? Lucian does not hint it. It looks as if one name had made the centre of a legend that grew two ways, a frequent phenomenon in mythology and hagiography.

fastening his letter so that by no trick could it be opened, while he explained to Menandrión the various devices by which seals could be circumvented and knots defied. His questions were absurd: "Doesn't Alexander wear a wig?" To which the prophet, unable to open the note, replied in terms of sheer nonsense. In two other papers an identical question was contained,—*"Where did Homer come from?"*—but the slave, coached in his part, made believe to yield to the innocent-seeming questions of Alexander, and divulged that the first petition turned on the cure of a pleurisy, the second referred to the manner of making a projected journey into Italy. So Lucian received two answers, the first being compact of common-sense and witch-wisdom alliteratively set forth: *"Plaster apply to Place and Speed-horse Spittle."* The second was: *"Go not by Sea but go on Foot by Road,"* which had at least the quality, unusual in oracles, of perspicuity. And again Lucian enclosed an identical question in eight packets, sending with these the price of eight oracles, at one drachma two obols apiece. Eight separate answers reached Lucian, having nothing to do, he declared, with anything in heaven or earth, and least of all with the question, which was, *"When shall Alexander be proved a charlatan?"*

No doubt rumours of this sort of fooling got about; certainly Alexander grew suspicious. He had too many accomplices ever to feel really safe: a whole staff had been organized: interpreters, to read and answer foreign letters; spies in big towns, most of all in Rome, to carry rapid information, to spread rumours, to detect probable inquiries, to explain answers. And indeed some answers needed revision; they obtained it, too, in the authorized edition of the Oracles. There was the unfortunate incident of Severianus' Armenian expedition; and the disastrous results of Marcus Aurelius' expedition against the Marcomani and the Quadi, which Alexander had favoured. Still, he had protected himself by enlisting the favour of the old-established shrines, sending to them clients who had applied to himself. He kept back letters containing compromising questions from influential personages who saw now, helplessly, that they had committed themselves irretrievably, and were at the mercy of the blackmail of one whom they could never denounce as the unscrupulous fraud they realized him to be. His prayers were valued: Apollo refused oracles till his spokesman should have begged the favour: he prayed, and miracles

broke out: diseases were cured, the dead raised more than once. He was able to satisfy a caviller who asked if the new-born Asclepius was the same as the old, by saying that it was a mystery: he hinted at a journey into the Far East. "They too," said he, "must profit by my sojourn upon the earth."

A grotesque incident made an end of all this for Menandrión. He was in the temple, one day, watching Alexander offering the serpent to be touched, and his own hand to be kissed, when he noticed Lucian standing by the barrier, and felt his blood chilled by the concentrated malevolence venomous in the man's face. Lucian put himself among the devotees and advanced to do homage. Alexander reached out his hand. There was a sudden yell, and a wild confusion, in which the prophet and Lucian, who was crouching to the level of Alexander's hand, appeared to be wrestling violently, while the snake's body, flung this way and that, lashed the walls and floor. Lucian had seized the forefinger of the outstretched hand between his teeth, which had fastened to it like a steel trap, almost biting it through. Menandrión uttered a scream of hysterical laughter. At once recognized as Lucian's squire, the crowd closed in around him, and among the howls of "Death to the Epicureans!" "Death to the Christians!" he was dragged outside, still screaming with laughter. A stone, suddenly striking his ankle, caused so acute a revulsion of agony that he fainted again, feeling himself almost torn limb from limb.

When Menandrión thus for the third time had to struggle back to life, he found himself in a garret lit only by a tiny lamp. A man of the merchant class, apparently, was sitting at his side watching him. Suddenly conscious that here was another rough shock, another change for the existence he had hoped would be so peaceful and simple, Menandrión, feeling very weak and quite helpless, began to cry.

"Quiet, quiet," said the man, taking his hand. "You are safe now."

"I am very tired," said Menandrión. "I am very unhappy."

The man lifted him up till the boy's head rested on his shoulder.

"Drink this, and then go to sleep," said he, putting a cup to his lips, and speaking simply to him, as to a baby, "go to sleep, in the love and companionship of God."

Menandrión turned his head till his face crushed hard against the man's chest, and he pressed his arms round his shoulders.

"Oh," he wailed, "for the love of the gods, take care of me ; don't sent me away ; I am all alone."

His whole body shook with sobs.

"Quiet, quiet ;" said the man once more. "I am here, and God is not absent."

But the next day, he was able to tell Menandrión what had happened. They were both in hiding, it seemed ; for the riot, begun in the temple, had extended to the whole town, and Epicureans and Christians had to hide from the mob. He was a Christian, and named Bacchylides : he had only just managed to escape with the unconscious boy, who had been dragged from beneath the very feet of the crowd ; the people had forgotten him directly he had fallen unconscious, and had made with one accord at Lucian. Menandrión had been smuggled into a wine-shop kept by a friend of Bacchylides, but not himself a Christian, and therefore unsuspected of harbouring atheists. Here man and boy lurked for at least a week, while the persecution raged furiously through the neighbourhood and then as suddenly disappeared. But Lucian, unconscious, too, owing to a blow on the head dealt by Alexander himself, had been rescued by the two mace-bearers whom the Government had just allotted to him, and was by them hurried rapidly down to the shore and put on board the state boat, which had immediately sailed, no one exactly knew whither.

"I can inquire, Menandrión, if you like," added Bacchylides. "Probably he has gone to Nicomedia or Chalcedon : the governor is there just now. But one can't be sure."

Menandrión showed no desire whatever of seeing Lucian again, and it cannot be said that Bacchylides was anxious to bring about the meeting.

But Menandrión, on learning that the merchant was a Christian, had felt his gratitude die. Apathetic after the first stroke of his calamity, save under the violent stimulus of a suggested return to the religious life, he had by now regained sufficient tone habitually to suffer if the source of his sorrows, as he deemed it, were put, however generally, before him. And this was the soul, the fundamental mystery in man, which exhaled this passion for the gods as a marsh exhales miasma : a passion which condensed into religions and rituals, even as vague mists canopied those marshes, pestilent and malodorous,

and everywhere, at all times, detestable. Still, he had to own himself once more dependant, and knew not where to look when Bacchylides pointed out that a longer stay at Abonoteichus was impossible. Apart from the risk and unwholesomeness of hiding, it was unfair to the innkeeper, who was after all not a Christian, and could not finally avoid suspicion. And though the danger was now practically past, and the Paphlagonian Church would willingly have given alms and shelter to a fellow-sufferer, even though not of the "household," yet it seemed better not to trespass too long on the poverty of these farmers and sailors, but to remove altogether beyond the zone of disturbance.

"But I have no home," said Menandrión.

"You shall come with me to Mycalé," had answered the Christian.

"Is that your home?" asked the boy with half-conscious envy.

"My old mother lives there," said he: "I have a little lodging in Miletus."

"Oh," cried the poor lad, quite suddenly bursting into tears; "why have I never had a mother?" And the stifled love of babyhood awoke, clamorous. The hunger for the complex, sacred relationship, for the playful surprises, the secrets, for the countless little human incidents of mutual love and tendance made divine by the soul which exists nowhere except in that intercommunion of motherhood and sonship, gnawed dreadfully at his heart. The offer of any diviner motherhood, that of the invisible Isis for instance, had it had even suggested itself, would have seemed an insult. That old dream, only the worse for its beauty, was done with. That it alone had filled all his past, was irrelevant, though of appalling sorrowfulness. Henceforward, according to his level of physical vitality at the moment, he oscillated between bitterness and dreary hopelessness; rage at a life already a failure, already stultified; misery over the past, empty of the one fact, for ever irrecoverable, which had filled it; and over the future, sure to be racked by the desires which essentially could not be appeased.

Just now he cried passionately, with sobs, like a child. There was much in him of arrested development. Only lately had the intelligence, energizing hitherto in a restrained circle of mystical theorems, been abruptly developed, in as narrow a region, however, of destructive logic, by Lucian.

He alternately accepted and rejected the proposal that he should live at Mycalé. What could he do? he knew no trade: he would simply be a burden. Bacchylides had tried to quiet him: who knew, indeed, what God might not intend for him, as a guide and leader, elect from boyhood, in the pure religion? And the Christian had a vision of the lad, linen-clad once more, bearing to a crowd of worshippers white bread, and a mysterious cup, and there descended a space of silence and of Heaven.

But Menandrión here violently repulsed him. He had had enough of that. At least no more prayer! no more worship! Bacchylides must only hope to have him on condition of never mentioning the cult which made him almost loathe his rescuer when he remembered it. And he kept obstinate silence when Bacchylides, for the first time, suggested the credentials of the Christian faith. Of the "mighty works" he would have nothing. He had seen enough of miracles, healings, visions, to make him hate all reference to them; as he already hated the cults which they adorned. Every religion vaunted its preternatural assets, and was a lie in proportion as these claimed to be numerous or startling. It was the devil, Bacchylides had been reduced to argue, who imitated the Christian miracles. Menandrión shrugged his shoulders. Without formulating his thoughts, he felt that the ultimate fact of evil will, named Set by Egypt, and "Satan," Bacchylides said, by Christianity, was at least more reasonably treated by a propitiatory worship than by a resistance surely doomed to defeat. And anyhow, to believe that Christianity was divine because of its miracles, and that their like, elsewhere verified, were diabolic imitations, implied a vicious circle. The argument held only for one already a Christian. Even the prophecies on which Bacchylides ultimately relied were only irritation to him. Lucian had trained him to cavil cleverly at the oracular: a prophecy could be made to mean anything *après coup*; forgery was not unknown; contradictions were numberless.¹

So Bacchylides was driven back to the taking of the great

¹ Eusebius, *contra Hierocl.*, and in a few places Arnobius, seem to be almost alone among the early Fathers to subject "pagan" miracles to criticism. This Eusebius does in the case of Apollonius of Tyana, partly on very dubious principles of probability; cf. § 436, 439. 448 especially; 454-7. Lactantius, *D.I.* II. 17, V. 3, frankly admitting, as is usual, the fact of the *miræ facta*, insists on their diabolic origin and the superior value of prophecy as a credential. Aug., *Ep.* cxxxvi. and cxxxviii., takes an identical position.

risk, of throwing his whole weight on the power of the unseen to make itself evident to the soul: not what he could say of or for Christ should quell Menandrión, but Christ Himself, living in His follower, should so woo that soul that neither its history of sharp tempest after a perhaps delusive calm, nor its present experience of a force centrifugal from Christ, should be able to defeat the divine solicitation. Only (and the thought brought him to his knees in a humility, an awe, untasted while, as hitherto, he had thought but of his own soul), what must be *his* life, *his* emptying of himself, if, for Menandrión, to meet *him* was to be the equivalent of meeting Christ; if only in *his* person contact with the Divine Personality was to be established!

Nor dare we deny that it was precisely the conflict between this magnetism of the King and Centre of all hearts, and the centrifugal force still mysterious in man and in the universe, which so racked Menandrión that after a few months spent in the farm on Mycalé, he was reduced to the very brink of despair. He could never have described, still less explained, that despair. That the fascination of Jesus had reached him, and that there was a something in him which cowered from it in horror, he could not have guessed. He never suspected that his shrinking from Bacchylides himself, was due simply to the fact that through him the attraction acted on his heart. At times, when that attraction was strong, he not only feared, but hated the Christian. Rather was he right (if he was indeed resolved upon resistance), to hate and fight *himself*, since in the very pulp and fibre of his soul was a quality, God-given, which was unintelligible, save in a response to the Divine activity its existence postulated; and which, if dumb or contradictory, would bring about the disruption of the whole nature of individual and cosmos. Years afterwards, Menandrión saw that, even then, in that subconscious self the divine battle raged which could only be quieted into the sabbath-rest of faith, or the eternal silence of spiritual death. For, one spring night, he climbed the rocky promontory, and, leaning against a little shrine of Isis, crumbling and defaced by the weather, he watched the sky and sea: to these simple terms had the question resolved itself; could he go back to live in that house where souls were on the rack; or should he not end all problems together, by an easy leap over the dark precipice at his feet?

Through the night, which so simply might be made unending, rose the murmur of the Mediterranean, swaying vaguely without tide, hundreds of feet below. Even that sound might so easily be stilled!

But, as he sat there in the dark, there came to him an initiation unasked, save by mute suffering; unchecked, save by the appreciation of an ecstasy; not to be recaptured, later, by memory, save as a fact the intellectual or emotional reproduction of which seemed so barren, so common, that its value appeared as trivial as its immediate result.

After two long hours, in which Menandrión remained fixed in a barely conscious introspection of his own meaningless and brutal aching, it became quite suddenly impossible to remain within the boundaries of himself, his fears and sorrows and decisions. Abandoning himself to powers greater than his own, he passed very rapidly through three stages of a swift soul-journey. First, he became suddenly awake to the immensity of the facts and forces round him: the giant air went freely in vast currents, none knew whence or whither, under the sky, and over a sea itself driven, huge masses of deep water, resistlessly round islands, deluging the inlets, stopped only by this coast heaved upwards into impregnable fastnesses, rocks indomitable as the sea itself. Stars, incredibly distant, appeared at times from behind the voyaging clouds. So helpless, he sat there! So tiny, so motherless! But the sharp point of the pain had long ago worn itself away against his heart, and he was aware only of the infinite heavy loneliness. Yet, doubtless because that night, as all hours of day and dark and twilight, was filled with the brooding wings of the Spirit who creates in love and orders to perfection, the sense of isolated hugenesses fell rapidly into the recognition of one vast force beneath the many, and this knowledge grew so swiftly that at once all that had seemed so great hurried towards nothingness: a reality englobed the world as of one that might measure the waters in the hollow of his hand, and mete out the heavens with a span, and weigh the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance, and take up the isles as a very little thing. The universe, and himself within it, seemed therefore to Menandrión to dwindle so rapidly that there was nothing to prevent its vanishing altogether, like a mist or a dream, before the face of this Ultimate and Absolute external to itself. And it was just as his spirit shrivelled and fainted in that race

towards annihilation, that it was abruptly rescued into a third condition, a resurrection into permanence and substantial life.

For that was not all! There was not merely the Infinite, on the one side, and on the other this vanishing wraith of a universe! Do what he would, he could not strangle the assurance, that in one will-made whole, God reached to that poor finitude; God was never aloof, but shepherded the centrifugal chaos, giving it value and consistency by holding it into His own heart, loving it, nursing it, and, as part of it, Menandrión. Never again could it crush him by its greatness, for God was its Father and Mother, and the world His little child; nor horrify him by its vanishing smallness, for God loved it; it could not lose its sonship, nor be orphaned of that immortal care. He withdrew then into God, and silence, better than in the old days, formed about him. For not needing now to leave the universe to find the divine, he took it with him, being brother of it all, into the centre of the divine encirclement. Rejecting nothing, denying nothing, save in its naked selfhood which could not, indeed, any longer offer itself to his attention, his heart expanded, triumphant, in the love of this Holy Family. Gasping, as it were, with happiness, he sat there in God's lap, and his Father exulted in him, and he was content wholly with his Father. Then the new life sank below the surface, and hid itself in an unknown secret of his soul, till, in its proper season, it should rise and flood him round about, and make one ocean with its source, and in its bosom carry Menandrión home.

But as he sat, the sun began very rapidly to rise. Before the sea could escape from the great shadow of Mycalé, the sky, much clearer now of clouds, glowed into the deep blue of daybreak, a blue distant beyond a gloom of gold, drawn by the level light. First at the horizon the sea became alive, deep purple with grey shadows, wrinkled and crawling, and then lilac, violet, blue. Innumerable islets stood out; Patmos, a pink cloud on the sky-line; Leros, and nearer islands, pulsating with the flaming glories of rose and of carnation; close to the right, the great ridge of Samos, edgeways to the sun, folded of splendour and of shadow. At the near left, the valley of Meander ran backwards into golden mist. And always as the rays struck the rocks, from ledge after ledge rose flights of sea-birds, wheeling and screaming in the keen and brilliant air. Over all sea and land, the colours flamed from harmony into

harmony of a great triumph hymn, throbbing in the heart of living flowers and jewels that were the islands, furnaces of ruby, topaz, beryl, and fretted gold, at whose feet the Mediterranean foamed too into music. The world witnessed to the Hebrew promise fulfilled: "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted; behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires."

And so Menandrión arose from beside the little crumbling shrine, itself gilded and alive with the new light.

"I will go back and live with the Christian," said he.¹

JAN DE GEOLLAC.

¹ "And in this he shewed a litle thing, the quantitie of a *Hasel-Nutt*, lying in the palme of my hand, as me seemed, and it was round as a Ball. I looked thereon, and thought, *What may this be?* and it was answered generallie thus. *It is all that is made.* I marvelled how it might last. For methought it might sodenlie have fallen to naught for litleness. And I was answered in my understanding, *It lasteth and ever shall, for God loveth it. And so hath all thing being by the love of God.*" (Juliana of Norwich, c. 5.)

Lucian (the conclusion to whose adventure has been slightly manipulated in this story) failed, in the end, to expose Alexander. The prophet reached such a pitch of insolence that he petitioned the Emperor that the name of Abonoteichus might be changed and a new coinage struck in his and Glykon's honour. He died miserably of a gangrened wound, and, says Lucian viciously, when they bathed his forehead during the fever, it turned out that he *did* wear a wig, and was in reality bald. All of which, says he, is enough to tempt one to believe in a divine providence.

The Real Authors of the Separation.

V. (continued.)

THE *Bulletin* for 1895¹ describes an interesting episode in the evolution of French Masonry. In that year, the Paris Lodges proposed that in Art. 1, paragraph 3, of the Masonic constitutions, after the words, "Freemasonry rejects all dogmatic affirmation," the following addition should be made: "And considers all religious practices to be harmful to the intellectual and moral improvement of mankind." The amendment was carried by these Lodges, but at the general meeting of Masons from the whole of France the addition was rejected, not because it did not represent the opinions of the members, but because it was useless and dangerous. It was useless, because "we all recognize that religious practices are harmful to the intellectual and moral improvement of mankind,"² and so it would be quite superfluous to make any change. It was dangerous, because

it must not be forgotten, my brothers, that it is easier to Freemasonize in Paris than in the provinces. We, Freemasons of the provinces, can work and make ourselves the apostles of Republican and anti-clerical ideas; but it is dangerous to write in our constitutions that we proscribe all religious ideas. . . . The reason why the proposal has for a number of years been always rejected by the Assembly is that, if we adopt the amendment and make it part of our statutes, the intercourse between French Freemasonry and certain other Grands-Orients will at once come to an end. You know, MM. FF., that it was in consequence of our having suppressed in our statutes all belief in the Grand Architect of the Universe, that our relations with certain extremely powerful Grands-Orients were broken off. Well then, the intercourse we still keep up with the remaining Grands-Orients will also come to an end if we proceed officially in our statutes to proclaim ourselves atheists.³

¹ In the July number, we traced the history of the Separation in the records of French Masonry as far as the year 1894.

In the last paragraph of the preceding article, the reference was accidentally omitted. The quotation is taken from *Bulletin du G.-O.*, 1894, p. 397.

² *Bulletin du G.-O.*, 1895, p. 310.

³ *Ibid.* 1895, p. 311.

We pass on to the *Bulletin* for 1897, which is mainly concerned with the elections of the coming year. We have already seen how the Lodges prepared for the elections of 1893. The same activity was shown in 1897, the only changes being that the subscriptions for propaganda purposes were doubled, that the socialistic evolution of Masonry had made a great advance in the interval, and that the anti-religious and anti-Catholic policy had become more fanatical. The following resolution gives the key-note of the proceedings :

The *Convent* of 1897 requires all Freemason candidates to bind themselves, before their respective Lodges, to favour all anti-clerical and socialistic laws.¹

This programme, however, could not be used outside the Lodges ; and one of the members thus pointed out the danger of allowing their real opinions to be known to the electorate :

With this formula, there is not a single Republican candidate who could take his stand before the country. . . . The majority of the electors are not as advanced as you think.²

The solution of the difficulty was very simple. All that the candidate had to do was to remain an "anti-clerical" at heart, and—deceive the electors. Once elected, he had plenty of time during the next five years to think of means of keeping his seat at the next elections, and of explaining his conduct in Parliament to his constituents. The duplicity and hypocrisy of all this, to use no harsher term, seem scarcely credible ; yet the solution of the difficulty, as accepted by the General Assembly, leaves no shadow of doubt in our minds as to the system recommended :

We must operate with great dexterity, as our enemies are powerful. Yes, in the secrecy of the Lodges, let us require the candidate to sign the programme ; but ask nothing more from him. . . . Ask for nothing which might compromise his canvass. . . . The candidate must not be required to make any of these declarations in public.³

The Assembly then closed the discussion by voting the following resolution :

The *Convent* of 1897 requires all candidates at the coming Elections, who rely on Masonic support, to deliver to the Venerable of their respective Lodges a signed declaration of their philosophical and political opinions. . . . No candidate will be required to placard this declaration.⁴

¹ *Compte-rendu*, 1897, p. 234. ² *Ibid.* p. 235. ³ *Ibid.* p. 236. ⁴ *Ibid.* p. 237.

One of the members present did not quite grasp the situation. His *naïve* question as to the morality of this double programme makes us wonder what such a candid soul was doing in this assembly of rogues. He said :

If this theory of the Commission be accepted, the Masonic candidate who has accepted the programme of the Lodges, but has promised less to his electors, will find himself obliged to break either the promise he made to his constituents, or the word he gave to the Council of the Order.¹

It is significant that no answer was forthcoming to this importunate question.

At the *Convent* of 1898, M. Bourceret, editor of *La Lanterne*, spoke of the "atrophying impress of Catholic dogmas," and exhorted his hearers to "accomplish the irremediable, the final ruin of clericalism, and of all the reactionary movements of which it is the hateful symbol."²

In 1899 :

I resume all I have said in one word—"the Republic ;" for this word means for me, anti-militarism, anti-clericalism, socialism.³

In 1900 :

We are men of tolerance, of course. But the case of legitimate defence creates special rights ; and, in presence of a social peril, the necessary action must take the place of sentimentality. Dogma is an instrument of domination and conquest ; let us combat dogma. And the first blow to be delivered, the one that will be most felt, will be to stop provisions (*suppression des vivres*—refuse the *budget des cultes*). . . . The Congregations may conspire, and form centres of resistance. Then dissolve and expel the Congregations. The Pope will protest. Then suppress our embassy at the Vatican.⁴

In 1902, M. Blatin, President of the General Assembly, said : "We shall have done nothing, as long as we have not broken with Rome and rejected the *Concordat*."⁵ From the same meeting we also learn that the *Bloc*, which triumphed at the elections of 1902, was the result of years of work and organization on the part of the Freemasons.

¹ *Compte-rendu*, p. 232.

² *Compte-rendu du G.-O.* 1898, p. 420. We have not thought it necessary to quote the resolution passed at each Annual Assembly in favour of the Separation. See, for example, *Compte-rendu*, 1898, p. 177 ; 1899, p. 263, &c.

³ *Ibid.* 1899, p. 370.

⁴ *Convent de Sept.* 1900 ; *Discours de Clôture*, p. 12.

⁵ *Compte-rendu*, 1902, p. 371.

Thanks to the organization of the Grand-Orient of France, to the organization of its Lodges, to its spirit of attachment to the Republic, we have triumphed. . . . We owe the victory to the committees of Republican defence, created by Masonry, to the political committees more or less advanced according to the state of mind of the population, but everywhere animated by the Masonic spirit.¹

The success of the *Bloc* was indeed a notable event in the annals of Freemasonry. The party could command a majority in Parliament; the anti-clerical laws which the Lodges had clamoured for these twenty years, were now certain to be voted, and the Lodges felt justified in singing the song of victory. Again, in the General Assembly of 1903, they re-asserted that the *Bloc* was a Masonic product, for, "if the formation of the *Bloc* has been possible, it is because in our Lodges, Republicans and Freemasons belonging to different and even opposite schools, have been able to meet and know and esteem each other."² However, they could not afford to waste too much time in congratulating each other in songs of triumph. The end was in view but had not yet been reached. The Parliamentary majority needed direction, and the Grand-Orient chose for this task M. Lafferre and M. Dubief, men of no very great ability, but recommended in the eyes of their Masonic brethren by their thoroughgoing sectarian spirit. Their duty was "to remind waverers of their duty towards the great Masonic community, to combine efforts, and, at the given time, to obtain results which scattered forces would never secure." After this election, another *député* arose and congratulated the Assembly on their choice of his colleague, M. Lafferre. "We could not have a better leader and guide in the fight we are making. This fight is far from being at an end, and we may well ask ourselves if the struggles we have gone through are not mere skirmishes in comparison with those that still await us."³ Evidently, the task of effecting the Separation would be a serious affair. But, if the country was in favour of the measure, and if Rome, though pretending to be against it, was really rendering it inevitable, there ought to have been no difficulty; the whole thing should have gone *comme sur des roulettes*. The country, however, did not, as a whole, favour the Separation, as the Freemasons themselves implicitly confessed, when they invented their discreditable methods for deceiving the electorate; and

¹ *Compte-rendu*, 1902, p. 153.

² *Ibid.* 1903, p. 208.

³ *Ibid.* 1902, pp. 405, 406.

the accusation regarding the attitude of Rome was, of course, merely a part of the *mensonge historique*.

The *Compte-rendu* for 1903 shows us the Freemasons looking forward to reaping in the near future the fruit of their labours; and as the end comes nearer, their language becomes more insulting and blasphemous. We translate two typical passages from the Proceedings, though we prefer to leave one phrase in the original French.

The triumph of the Galilean has lasted twenty centuries; . . . He in His turn is disappearing, *le Dieu menteur*! He is on His way to join in the dust of ages the other divinities of India, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, which saw so many deluded creatures prostrate at the foot of their altars. We, Freemasons, have pleasure in stating that we have had something to do with this ruin of false prophets. The Roman Church, founded on the Galilean myth, began to decline rapidly from the day on which the Masonic association was formed.¹

These words were pronounced by M. Delpéch, at that time President of the Masonic Council, and one of the influential members of the Senatorial majority which ratified the Separation Bill passed by the *Chambre des Députés*.

At the same *Convent*, another Member of Parliament, M. Massé, said:

All measures tending to diminish the authority of the Church as a political party, to lessen her power, to limit her riches, to withdraw from her influence and domination the minds of the young, children of to-day, citizens of to-morrow, are measures which we cannot but approve of, as they take us a step forward in the way of intellectual emancipation. . . . The work will not be complete until the connection between Church and State has been definitely broken.²

VI.

This long list of extracts from private Masonic documents, which could be multiplied *ad libitum*, shows the persevering continuity of the anti-religious policy of the Lodges. Masonic organization is now sufficiently complete; the separation cannot now be long delayed. In fact, the wonder is that it had to wait until 1905. The Masonic *Bloc*, elected in 1902, had a working majority. An active Freemason, M. Combes, was Prime Minister, the real head of the French Republic. The Cabinet, composed of twelve Ministers, contained at least eight

¹ *Compte-rendu*, 1903, p. 381.

² *Ibid.* p. 399.

Masons: Combes, Vallé, Delcassé, Rouvier, Mongeot, Pelletan, Doumergue, and Bérard; while the Secretary for War, General André, if not a Mason, was at least extremely friendly to them, for he did all in his power to get officers in the army to join the sect. Why then the delay in voting the Separation? The fact is, that the country, as we have seen above (and the fact cannot be too often insisted upon), was not ready for it. M. Combes himself said so more than once. In a speech delivered in the Senate on March 21st, 1903, he said:

To denounce the *Concordat* just now, without having sufficiently prepared men's minds for it, *without having clearly proved that the Catholic clergy themselves are provoking it and rendering it inevitable*, would be bad policy, by reason of the resentment which might be caused in the country against the Government. I do not say that the connection between Church and State will not some day be severed; I do not even say that that day is not near. I merely say that the day has not yet come.¹

But why prepare men's minds? Why was the day not yet come? The *Bloc* desired it, and the Catholics also, *if* what M. Combes said about them is true.

Again, on January 14th, 1905, M. Combes made the same confession in the Chamber:

I have always been in favour of the Separation of the Churches and State; but when I took office, I thought public opinion insufficiently prepared for this reform; I deemed it necessary to bring opinion round to it.²

English readers will doubtless remember M. Combes' article in the *National Review* for March, 1905, where he makes the same confession. He, together with the majority of his Ministers,

regarded this divorce as the logical completion of the work of emancipating lay society from clerical control. But we all felt that it would be inopportune and imprudent to include so momentous a measure in the Ministerial programme, as public opinion had not been adequately prepared for it. Nevertheless, I intended to pave the way for this great reform.

The way was paved by a series of mean provocations, the object of which was to shift the responsibility and odium on to other shoulders. If it could be made out that Rome by her impossible attitude was the real author of the Separation, then

¹ Quoted in the Vatican White Book.

² *Ibid.*

the Government need not fear the resentment of the country. Pretexts for a quarrel were soon found in M. Loubet's visit to Rome and the protest of the Holy Father against the intended insult, in the discussions which arose concerning the nomination of Bishops, and in Rome's treatment of the Bishops of Dijon and Laval. Leaving the Vatican White Book to vindicate the correct and patient attitude of the Holy Father with regard to these questions, we now return to the Freemasons. What were they doing during this time? The *Compte-rendu* of their General Assembly in 1903, contains a long glorification of M. Combes. A vote of confidence in him was passed and sent to M. Combes, who answered by telegram, saying that he would do all in his power to meet their wishes.¹ "It is certainly very gratifying," said M. Lafferre, "to look about us, to congratulate ourselves on the results achieved with the help of Masonry, to send orders of the day to the Ministry, and to receive telegrams from them showing what an important place we occupy in the Republic." The speaker then went on to discuss their anti-clerical policy, especially the Associations Law which M. Combes was to carry through, and ended with a brutal peroration. The clericals would of course complain and protest against the coming legislation; "but you must see to it that they have something to cry for. They must not whimper for nothing; *vous avez l'obligation stricte de légitimer leurs plaintes.*"²

In the General Assembly of the following year, 1904, the same vote of confidence was sent to M. Combes, coupled with the request that he should introduce the Separation Bill as soon as Parliament met again in January. M. Combes again answered by telegram, assuring them "that he would endeavour by all the means in his power to realize as rapidly as possible the reform indicated in the address."³

We have already mentioned M. Loubet's visit to Rome. That the object of this visit was to pick a quarrel with the Vatican was obvious from the very first; but it is well to have the explicit testimony of the Freemasons. After M. Loubet's visit, M. Hubbard was able to announce to the General Assembly of 1903: "We are now in an excellent position. . . . Ought we not to say to the head of the Government, 'Go ahead' (*marchez*)."

Again, in April, 1904, at a Masonic

¹ See *Le Correspondant*, February 25th, 1904, pp. 633 ff., where long quotations from the *Compte-rendu* of 1903 are given.

² *Ibid.* p. 653.

³ *Le Correspondant*, June 10, 1905, p. 887.

meeting held at Orléans, M. Level said : "We can gather the consequences of the visit of the head of the Republic to Rome, —separation of the Churches and State. . . . The Lodges can justly claim their share in such a result ; they have powerfully contributed thereto."¹ We thus come to close quarters with the *mensonge historique*.²

The order to "go ahead" went forth from the Grand-Orient, as we have seen, towards the end of 1904. Early in 1905 (the time specified by the Freemasons), the Separation Bill was introduced in Parliament by their agent, M. Combes. There was never any doubt that the Bill would pass. The only doubtful point was whether it would be a Liberal or a Masonic Separation ; and even that doubt was soon dispelled. The Liberal Separation would have done nothing more than rescind the contract known as the *Concordat*, leaving to the Church her property and full liberty in the exercise of religious worship. The Masonic Separation aimed at the destruction of the Church by robbing her of her churches and property, by encouraging schisms, and by raising up a host of difficulties to prevent her from accomplishing her mission.³ The quotations we have given above from official Masonic documents clearly show that they wished to make an end of the Church. We have also seen that as far back as 1884 they hoped some day to enter into possession of the churches, there "to preach their doctrines, and make the vast naves resound with Masonic mallets and acclamations instead of clerical psalmodies."

While the Separation Bill was being discussed in Parliament, the confiscation of the churches and Church property was occupying the attention of the Lodges. This fact may be gathered

¹ *Compte-rendu des travaux du G.-O.*, January—June, 1904, p. 105.

² M. Maujan, an eminent Mason, and one of M. Combes' most faithful henchmen in Parliament, wrote in the *Radical*, February 3, 1905 : "Les républicains semblaient ignorer que l'homme qui rendit la séparation inévitable n'était autre que M. Combes. C'est la volonté, c'est la passion de M. Combes qui nous a acculés à cette nécessité inéluctable. Oui, c'est ce diable d'homme qui par ses manigances a amené les choses en cet état qui réjouit si fort les républicains."

Clémenceau, a good judge in these matters, said : "La rupture des relations diplomatiques avec le Vatican n'est qu'une indigne comédie, si ce n'est la préface de la dénonciation du Concordat." (Quoted in *Parliament*, cf. *Journal Officiel*, April 3, 1905, p. 1107.)

³ "What kind of separation do we, Freethinkers, require ? It must be a separation that will lessen the mischievousness of the Church and of religions. . . . I ask the Left to decide that the Church, being a political danger, shall be fought in every way." (*Journal Officiel*, April 11, 1905, p. 1294.)

from an infamous picture-postcard which was being distributed broadcast in April, 1905, in preparation for the Congrès de la Libre-Pensée to be held in the September of the same year. Comte de Mun, in the *Gaulois*, April 10, 1905, thus describes this postcard:

I have before me, as I write, a postcard which is being freely distributed. It represents the Church of the Sacred Heart. Over the door are written the words, "People's Palace. Theatre." Crowds are making their way in. Close by, three men are holding up a large pole, on the top of which is hung the following inscription: "The play for this evening is *Tartuffe*; to-morrow, *Torquemada*." In a corner of the card we read, "Libre-pensée internationale, Congrès de Paris, 4, 5, 6, et 7 Septembre, 1905."

The dates are instructive. This postcard was being distributed in April, 1905. On July 3rd of the same year the Separation Bill passed the Lower House. The Basilica of the Sacred Heart was to be a theatre in September. In this same month was to be held the Congrès de la Libre-Pensée, organized by the Association nationale des libres-penseurs de France, the President of which is an active Freemason, M. Ferdinand Buisson, *Député* for Paris, and Chairman of the commission for the Separation of Church and State.

The postcard appears again in the *Bulletin* of the Congress, together with two other illustrations. One of these represents a village church, over the door of which is posted a large placard: "To be let as a museum, or popular university, or for secularist festivals (*fêtes laïques*)."

The third illustration shows a *coq gaulois* swooping down upon a terrified crow. The *corbeau*, of course, represents the clergy, and to prevent any misunderstanding a priest's hat is poised on its head. The title of this production is, "The last struggle." Among those responsible for this *Bulletin* we find the names of M. Buisson, and M. Lafferre, the official leader of Masonic Members of Parliament.

The Masonic separation aims at more than the confiscation of church property.¹ The kind of separation they wished for was one which would "dechristianize" France, abolishing not merely Catholicism and every other form of Christian religion, but even God Himself. As this aspect of the separation has

¹ During the discussion of the Separation Bill on April 21, 1905 (the famous Good Friday sitting), M. Briand admitted that *la libre pensée* had no other object in bringing about the Separation, than *de se coucher dans le lit de l'Eglise*.

been most inadequately treated by the majority of Paris correspondents to English newspapers, it becomes necessary to make the point clear, and to define "dechristianization" in the very words of various accredited spokesmen of French Freemasonry.

M. Buisson, whom we have just mentioned, writes thus in the *Radical*:

The State without God, the school without God, the home without God, the law courts without God,—there you have the idea of a human society based exclusively on human nature, on its phenomena and laws.¹

In the *Chambre des Députés*, on April 12, 1905, during the discussion of the Separation Bill, M. Meslier,² who to judge from the important part he takes in the General Assembly of the Grand-Orient, is one of the leaders of the sect, thus explained his reason for giving his vote in favour of the Separation Bill:

My vote shall be a declaration of atheism and the manifestation of my desire to see the idea of God disappear from our laws and customs, that idea, which has hitherto caused nothing but misery and bloodshed in our country.

Another Freemason, M. Debierre, at a General Assembly of the Grand-Orient, told his hearers that as long as women and children keep the faith and practise their religion, so long will the separation be a failure. They must see to it, that the separation—that is, the separation as understood by the Lodges—penetrates into the home circle.³ M. Lafferre, the Masonic agent in Parliament, is still more explicit:

We are as anti-religious, as we are anti-clerical (*applaudissements*). . . . The real object we are aiming at, is the ruin of all dogmas and the downfall of all the Churches.⁴

¹ *Radical*, August 10, 1904.

² At the General Assembly of the Grand-Orient in 1904, he presented a long report on the *réglementation de la prostitution*. The disgusting details of the report, and the obvious intention of the speaker were such that another speaker ventured to suggest that M. Meslier had allowed himself to be carried too far by his well-known anti-clerical sentiments, and that he would perhaps regret his words, if they were printed in the *Compte-rendu*. However, the question was put to the vote, and by a large majority the report was ordered to be printed. (Cf. *Le Correspondant*, June 10, 1905, p. 894.)

³ "Tant que la séparation n'aura point pénétré au sein du foyer familial et que les femmes et les enfants se rendront à la messe et au confessionnal, . . . la séparation ne sera qu'un fard qui masquera la persistance de l'assujettissement à la folie confessionnelle." (Text given by M. Lerolle, *Annales de la Jeun. Cath.* 1906, p. 342.)

⁴ *Compte-rendu*, 1904; cf. *Le Correspondant*, June 10, 1905, p. 899.

Lastly, a Cabinet Minister dared in open Parliament, to describe the work of the anti-clericals as a "work of irreligion." The speech in question was delivered by M. Viviani on November 8, 1906, in the *Chambre des Députés*, and those who follow French affairs will probably remember that the blasphemous passages were suppressed by English correspondents in Paris, who dealt fully with the rest of the speech. Protests, however, were made, and the following translation was sent to the *Times* by Mr. Alfred Austin in a letter dated the 2nd of December.

The Third Republic has summoned round it the children of peasants and artisans, and into their dim minds instilled by degrees the revolutionary seeds of instruction. But that was not enough. All in unison, through our forefathers, our elders, and our own decision, we have associated ourselves with the past in the work of anti-clericalism, in the work of irreligion. We have liberated the human conscience from Faith. When some poor wretch, weary with the weight of his daily labour, kneels to pray, we lift him up, we say to him that behind the mists, there is nothing but chimeras. Together, and with magnificent gesture, we have extinguished in Heaven the lights that will never be lit afresh.¹

VII.

It was this "dechristianization" which the Separation Law aimed at. Destroy the Church in France, and all the rest would follow in the natural course of things; and the Church would be destroyed, not all at once, but in a fairly brief period, by their Law. Not that the mere rescinding of the *Concordat* would have been sufficient; the Law would have to be "properly made," that is, besides renouncing the contract, conditions and clauses must be added which would encourage schism. Here we have the key-note of the Masonic policy: Encourage schism and dissensions in the Church. The enemies of the Church knew this much about her, that she would no longer be the Church, when once her unity was destroyed. They had complete confidence in their method, and spoke openly of the dismemberment of the Church which would certainly

¹ The *Journal Officiel* tells us that these last words were greeted with "vifs applaudissements à gauche et à l'extrême-gauche;" also, that "La Chambre, par 340 voix contre 128, ordonne l'affichage du discours de M. Viviani." By *affichage* is meant, that the speech is printed and posted up in every Commune in France, all at the expense of the State.

follow. Clemenceau, before he entered the Cabinet, wrote thus in his newspaper, the *Aurore*:

How will they avoid the fatal differences which necessarily arise among men? Hitherto the Church has stifled these differences, first by violence, then by State privileges. Liberty will make them live again, and the authority of the infallible Pope will suffer cruelly therefrom. From the rival of *sociétés cultuelles* to schism, there is but a step. The Church saw this only too clearly, when she condemned the separation as incompatible with the unity of her dogma.¹

In the private meetings of the Grand-Orient, we find the same virtue ascribed to the separation. "A short period of separation," said the orator of the General Assembly held in September, 1904, "will complete the ruin of dogma and the ruin of the Church overcome by indifference."² In other words, vote the separation with its system of *Associations Cultuelles*, and then let things take their course. However, when the Bill had passed and become law, things did not seem to be moving fast enough.³ The Church was evidently going to take a very long

¹ *Vide, Le Correspondant*, March 10, 1905, p. 1060. See also, on the same page, an extract from a speech delivered at Besançon by the Préfet of Doubs, in which he thus betrays the intentions of the party: "When the separation has been promulgated—I do not say immediately, but in a very short time—you will see schism make its way into the Catholic Church, dividing it into several sects which will find themselves forced to throw off, one after another, the yoke of Rome."

M. Lafferre, in the *Action*, thus speaks of the Pope's condemnation mentioned above by Clemenceau. "I fail to understand the excitement caused by the Papal Encyclical among a certain number of Republicans. Did those, who voted the separation, really expect the Pope to accept it?" (Quoted in the *Figaro*, September 3, 1906.)

They knew the law was unacceptable to the Church, and they meant it to be so. This throws further light on the *mensonge historique*.

² *Compte-rendu du G.-O.*, 1904; cf. *Le Correspondant*, June 10, 1905, p. 905.

³ In October, 1906, Adolphe Retté, poet and publicist, was received into the Church. Soon after, he performed a great act of humility by publishing an account of his life and conversion, which shows him to have been in politics an extreme Radical, and in religion and morality to have descended to the lowest depths. In his book there is an instructive passage on the methods of the anti-clericals. He was present, he tells us, at a Radical meeting presided over by a politician, "who in his articles and speeches, makes a great show of liberalism and tolerance. The subject under discussion was the separation. Replying to certain members who complained of the gentleness and slowness shown in the spoliation of the secular clergy and in hindering Public Worship, the chairman said: 'Leave it to us. We shall strangle the priests quietly, without ceasing to talk of liberty, and what is better, by giving the country to understand that they (the clergy) began the quarrel.' Thinking that he had perhaps spoken too frankly, he added, '*Cela, entre nous, n'est-ce pas?*'" Retté adds that up till then, in spite of evidence, "I had almost believed in the pretended good faith of the Government in the affair of the separation." (Retté, *du Diable à Dieu*, pp. 108, 109.)

time to die; and differences of opinion arose among her enemies as to the methods to be adopted for hastening on the death.¹ One party desired the clauses of the separation law to be applied in all their severity, and other more stringent measures to be added; there was to be no truce, no pact, no concession. Others, taking for granted that the disappearance of the Church was only a matter of time, were willing to grant concessions, which, while giving the Catholics a certain amount of satisfaction and keeping them reasonably quiet, would not prejudice the final success of the anti-clerical programme. It is not yet quite certain which policy will be definitely adopted by the changeable Government; but in any case, the Freemasons need have no misgivings. As long as M. Clemenceau,² is in power, every possible means will be taken to ensure the success of their efforts. His life has been one long profession of atheism. He has never ceased to work not merely for the separation, but for the destruction of the Church; and he no doubt wishes to complete the work, before his precarious tenure of office comes to an end.

The various additional measures put into execution since the promulgation of the separation, in order to put still greater difficulties in the way of the Church, are part and parcel of the original plan. The law, as passed by the Senate in December, 1905, was never meant to be the last word on the separation. Many of the clauses in this confused and obscure piece of legislation are merely provisory, and in order to discover in what sense they are to be amended or added to, we turn to the *Compte-rendu* of the General Assembly of the Grand-Orient, held in 1904. The *Convent* of that year was principally

¹ The childish *brouilles* of Clemenceau and Briand in Parliament, and their dramatic reconciliations are mere side-play. On the main point—the necessity of destroying the Church—they are in perfect accord; they differ only as to pace and methods. The former was thought to be too violent and hasty; Briand was too gentle and slow. If there were any real contradiction between the ideas of the two Ministers, then Briand's conduct in consenting to remain in Clemenceau's Cabinet and taking his share of responsibility for the policy pursued, is very strange indeed.

Clemenceau wants the patient to disappear at once and give no more trouble. Briand is for *euthanasia*; he would prefer to let the Church die off quietly by gradual exhaustion. Clemenceau is for cudgels, Briand for chloroform.

² As to Clemenceau's general attitude towards religion, it may be useful to give the testimony of one who is, or was until lately, the intimate friend of Clemenceau. "It was at this time that I made the acquaintance of Clemenceau. . . . I fell completely under his influence, which I testified to him—and I say this without fear of being contradicted—by an entire *dévouement*; and his hold on me manifested itself in me by a recrudescence of anti-religious fury. This period of my life was, I think, the one during which I blasphemed most." (Retté, *du Diable à Dieu*, pp. 38—40.)

occupied in explaining away the conduct of the Masonic Council in the affair of the *fiches* and delation in the Army. But anti-clericalism was not forgotten, and a resolution was carried to the effect that "the imperfect but perfectible law on the separation of Churches and State, already voted by the Lower House, be adopted as quickly as possible by the Senate and promulgated before the General Elections, and that it be afterwards amended by Parliament *dans un sens plus nettement laïque*."¹

We all knew that the Law was imperfect, but we are glad to learn on such good authority how it is to be made perfect. It is sufficient to examine the Separation Law itself, to see that it needs some kind of amendment. There is only one clear and definite clause—that which decrees the confiscation of ecclesiastical property; the rest is confused and obscure. The strangeness and arbitrariness of many of its clauses puzzled us, at least at first. Why, we asked ourselves, should the Law allow the *Associations Cultuelles* to lease the presbyteries for the term of ten years, after which time the municipality may permit or refuse a new lease? But we are now beginning to see more clearly. The authentic interpretations already quoted have enlightened us on this point, and if we had access to more Masonic documents or could assist at some of their private meetings, we should probably be able to explain many other items. It was hoped that, in a short time, the separation and

¹ *Compte-rendu du G.-O.*, 1905; cf. *Le Correspondant*, February 10th, 1906, p. 576.

This is also the view taken by M. Briand. On April 6th, 1905, he said in Parliament: "You must face the necessity of preserving the places of Public Worship in order to leave the Republic every possible hold on the Church." When he was attacked by M. Allard (the man who described God as "the clumsy contriver of a misfit world"—*fabriquant maladroit d'un monde raté*), on account of his apparent moderation in the conduct of the anti-clerical campaign, he explained more than once that everything could not be done immediately; it was necessary to proceed slowly, and bring in the successive measures with caution; *il faut ménager les transitions*.

After the publication of the Encyclical forbidding Catholics to form *cultuelles*, the Government brought in a new *projet de loi*, and M. Briand thus explained himself: "The Bill we now present to you is not the result of the new circumstances in which the attitude of the Holy See has placed us. . . . Long ago, even during the preceding Ministry, we had foreseen the situation in which we find ourselves to-day, and had thought of the means we might be called upon to employ in order to deal with it." (*Journal Officiel*, December 22nd, 1906, p. 3393.)

Perhaps we ought not to lay too much stress on these last words, as M. Briand himself, a few weeks before, declared that he had not foreseen the situation, and that he had made no preparations to meet it. (*Journal Officiel*, November 10th, 1906, p. 2458.)

the system of *Associations Cultuelles* would have produced the desired result; that the Church would break up into as many schisms as there are parishes. The time allowed for the movement to become general is roughly fixed at ten years. If, here and there, it may seem advisable to continue the lease a little longer the Mayors may do so. At least, such is the present disposition of the Law, but recent events seem to indicate that the powers vested in these officials will be withdrawn in the near future.

In connection with this term of ten years, we may note that the Civil Constitution of the Clergy under the Directoire lasted ten years, from 1791 to the signing of the *Concordat* in 1801. During those years the Church remained steadfast, and the Directoire were compelled by the clamours of the people to allow the churches to be reopened. Do our modern Jacobins¹ hope for better success during their ten years?

We cannot better resume the preceding pages than by translating a few lines from an article which appeared in the *Journal de Genève* for September 22nd, 1906. The testimony there given is all the more valuable, as the *Journal* can hardly be suspected of Catholic bias.

Freemasonry, as everybody knows, wishes to destroy Catholicism in France. It will not relent nor rest until it has overthrown the Church. All its energies are directed to this one end. It appears to deal gently with other religions, if indeed it does not ignore them for the moment. It says to itself, no doubt, that when the life of Catholicism has been crushed out under its grip, the annihilation of the other Churches will be mere child's play. But the adversary is not yet overwhelmed; she is like Anteus, who found new strength each time he touched the ground. Freemasonry is well aware of the fact, and so far has refrained from bringing the struggle to a head, lest the adversary might suddenly put forth her full strength. At times, Masonry seems to grant a truce; but as soon as the Catholics seem to be sufficiently off their guard, it once more throws itself upon its prey. These tactics will be continued until the final triumph.

Is this triumph near at hand or still far off? At the present moment, Rome is well on her guard, and Pius X. is not the man to let himself be taken in by a sham disarmament.

OSWALD KELLET.

¹ Such phrases as, "The glorious principles of the Revolution," or, "We date from 1789," or, "It was we who produced the Revolution," &c., are frequently met with in the Masonic *Comptes-rendus*.

The University of Oxford and the Reformation.

II.

THE Royal Commissioners at Oxford were naturally confronted with a great difficulty, which consisted in filling up the vacant posts with suitable candidates. As a matter of fact, very unfit people were in many cases appointed, *faute de mieux*; just as all over the country the lowest of the people were being thrust into the benefices vacated by the faithful clergy. "It is certain," says Mr. Brodrick, "that Oxford lost many Catholic scholars whom she could ill spare," and it is also certain that their successors were very inferior men. It is true that many of those who had been deprived under Mary were learned men, but several of these were now dead, such as Ponet, Sir James Haddon, Sir John Cheke (the last-named, however, died in the Church). But the new candidates under Elizabeth were of an inferior type. These Marian exiles, who flocked over to England with great expectations and greedy maws, were not always the kind of men one would choose to set over a learned society. Their hopes ran high of a rich reward after the trials and privations of exile, and they were not always easy to satisfy. They were filled, too, with rancorous hatred for the Catholics, and eager to begin a counter-persecution. Some of them, like Cole, of Corpus, enriched themselves at the expense of the Colleges into which they were thrust. Studies made no progress under such men. Anyone who was not a thorough Puritan was looked on with suspicion and dislike, the Queen's attempt to tread the *via media* and form a High Anglican party was very unpopular with them, and when they did not dare to oppose it openly, they grumbled much against it in secret. Even taking the oath of supremacy was not enough to protect men from the suspicion of Popery, and a system of espionage and delation grew up, which must gradually have tended to make life intolerable for men who had Catholic sympathies,

and no doubt had much to do towards bringing many of the waverers back to the Faith.

We see an instance of this in the life of the Blessed Edmund Campion. He and his friends, Mayne of St. John's, Ford of Trinity, Sherwin of Exeter, and the rest (now all numbered among the martyrs of Christ), were for some years in doubt before they took the final step and left all things for Him. At last, in 1569, Campion left Oxford, so long the scene of his open triumphs and of his secret anguish, and after a stay in Ireland, went to join Allen at Douay. One of his letters to Mayne entreating him to imitate his example, fell into the hands of the Bishop of London, who at once caused all those named in the letter to be arrested. Mayne, however, being absent from Oxford, was warned in time by Blessed Thomas Ford, and escaped.

Bishop Pilkington, writing in 1563, laments as follows :

Look into the Universities and spy what ancient learned men ye find there, either Papist or Protestant. I am ashamed to tell, and it is to be lamented to see that there is so few, and it is earnestly to be begged at God's hands that it may be amended ; but I fear it is rather to be wished than hoped for. The plague is over our heads, not regarded, and cannot be avoided, howsoever the world go.

Jewel, writing soon after the accession of Elizabeth, declares :

Our Universities are so depressed and ruined that at Oxford there are scarcely two individuals who think with us, and even they are so dejected and broken in spirit that they can do nothing. . . . You would scarcely believe that so much desolation could have been effected in so short a time. So that although it would give me the greatest pleasure, under other circumstances, to see even a dog from Zurich in England, yet I cannot at this time recommend you to send your young men to us, either for a learned or religious education, unless you would have them sent back to you wicked and barbarous.

In 1560 he wrote to Peter Martyr : "Our Universities, and more especially Oxford, are most sadly deserted ; without learning, without lectures, without any regard to religion." Bishop Parkhurst described the University roundly as "a den of thieves." But that was only his polite way of describing Catholics !

At Corpus Christi in 1578, a revolution took place similar to that which had transformed Merton. The Queen interfered in the most high-handed way with the liberties of the College,

quashed the election of a Catholic President, and forced upon the College one Cole, who was a married man and a Zwinglian. The staunchest of the Fellows were summarily expelled, among them being Ven. George Napper, the Oxford martyr. As to Cole, "being settled in his place [says Wood], he acted so foully by defrauding the College and bringing it into debt, that even Bishop Horne, who had been the Queen's willing instrument in forcing him on the College, was obliged to take him to task. 'Well, well, Mr. President, seeing it is so, you and the College must part without any more ado, and therefore see that you provide for yourself.' Cole was thunderstruck. 'What, my good lord, must I then eat mice at Zurich again?' " he faltered. This allusion to their common exile so touched Horne, that he allowed the defaulter to remain, and in the end he got no worse punishment than translation to the deanery of Lincoln.

The character of the new authorities may be imagined from a typical instance. Dr. Thomas Holland, a Fellow of Balliol, became Regius Professor of Divinity. "He was an Apollos mighty in the Scriptures," we are told. "He was familiarly conversant with the Fathers and as a Father amongst them." In 1592 he was made Master of Balliol by Queen Elizabeth's influence, in order to subdue the Catholic leaven which showed such vitality in that House. Whenever he started on a journey he used to quit his Fellows with the valediction, "*Commendo vos dilectioni Dei et odio Papatus et omnis superstitionis.*"

Nevertheless, the Catholic leaven throughout the University was exceedingly hard to eradicate. In 1564, the Queen's notorious favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, became Chancellor, an office which he held till his death in 1587. His great influence was thrown strongly on to the side of the Puritanical party, and he did his utmost to expel from the University all those suspected of holding Catholic views. Mr. Brodrick significantly remarks that "it may be doubted whether there was as much real freedom of thought in the Protestant Oxford of Elizabeth, as in the Catholic Oxford of the first three Edwards."

The new Professors described the University in very dark colours. They complained of the universal dislike of higher education, and the ever-growing love of pleasure and dissipation among the students. This was in great part, as Zimmermann has pointed out, the result of the teaching of the new doctrines,

whose supporters ridiculed the scholastic theology and philosophy, while they supplied nothing to take its place. Then the doctrine of the universal priesthood, and the theory that every one was capable of understanding and interpreting the Holy Scriptures, lowered the dignity and reputation of the clerical state in the eyes of the laity. Good Catholics could no longer send their sons to Oxford, the poor were no longer admitted, the sons of the rich who had gained their wealth by the spoils of the monasteries, had no inclination for the clerical state, even the middle classes ceased to care for degrees which brought with them no honour or profit. In the year 1561, Wood relates that only eight students took their degrees in arts, three in physics, one in law, and none at all in theology.

It may be doubted whether Queen Elizabeth's famous visits to the University did much for it, except to increase the already prevalent love of amusements, and while they may no doubt have stimulated the spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the Sovereign, they may even have increased the general dislike for study. In fact, these royal visits with their dramas and pageants, probably laid the foundation for the abuses of which so many complaints were heard later on; and though the play-acting in Christ Church Hall, &c., seems not to have been without influence on the development of the English drama, Milton is not perhaps unduly severe in his animadversions on these amusements as the source of much of the unruliness, luxury, and extravagance, which became so prevalent in Elizabethan Oxford. Side by side with stern edicts aimed at the suppression of Popery, we find equally stringent ones aimed by Leicester at the sumptuary extravagances of the students. The non-collegiate students were suppressed, as the institution was thought to favour Popery, and at the same time the dress and demeanour of the students of Popish days were held up as an example to an untoward generation.

The principal interest to Catholics in the Queen's visit of 1566 is the prominent part in it played by Blessed Edmund Campion. Richard Bristow of Exeter, later one of the most famous Catholic controversialists, also took part in the public disputations before her Majesty.

We must now turn away from Oxford for a while, to cast a glance at the work that was being done in the Low Countries by the Oxford exiles who had taken refuge there.

We cannot attempt here to do more than allude to the

inception of that great work started at Douay by Dr. Allen and the Oxford men whom he had gathered round him.

William Allen, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, had been Principal of St. Mary's Hall and Canon of York. When driven out from Oxford, he crossed over to Flanders in 1561, and took up his abode at the University of Louvain, where he found many of his old friends who had preceded him. At Louvain were settled such men as Thomas Harding, of New College, late Regius Professor of Hebrew, Richard Smith, late Regius Professor of Theology, John Clement, late Professor of Greek and Rhetoric, who married Margaret Giggs, the foster-daughter of Blessed Thomas More, John Ramridge of Merton, D.D., late Archdeacon of Derby, William Rastell, judge and printer, the nephew of Blessed Thomas More, Nicholas Sander, of New College, late Professor of Canon Law, and Blessed John Storey the martyr, late Principal of Broadgates Hall, Regius Professor of Civil and Canon Law, and Chancellor of the dioceses of Oxford and London. Perhaps the most famous of all was Thomas Stapleton, Fellow of New College and Canon of Chichester, unsurpassed as a controversialist, author and theologian. Besides these illustrious Oxford men there was Cuthbert Scott, the last Catholic Bishop of Chester, and other worthies of the University of Cambridge.

At Louvain these exiles set themselves to work, and produced a series of powerful controversial treatises in defence of the Catholic Faith and confutation of Protestant errors. Their books were smuggled over to England in large quantities, and produced a powerful effect in confirming waverers and reclaiming many who had fallen away. It is touching to read that the exiles called the two houses in which they lived at Louvain, Oxford and Canterbury. Allen returned to England in 1562, and spent three years, at first in his native Lancashire and then in the neighbourhood of Oxford devoting himself to the work of fortifying in the Faith all whom he could influence, and especially of urging them to abstain from all communication with heretics in the Protestant worship by law established. May we not venture to trace to his powerful influence, at least in part, the staunchness in the faith which ever distinguished both Lancashire and this University of Oxford? At last he was forced to leave England once more and retire to the Continent, where an even greater work awaited him. His enlightened zeal showed him that the great danger which

threatened the Faith in England lay in the dying out of the ancient priesthood, and he resolved to do what he could to remedy this evil by founding a College for English students abroad. His first idea was rather to train up a band of learned priests who might be capable of restoring the Catholic religion in England whenever circumstances might permit, and meanwhile might instruct in their religion English boys who might be sent to them for education. But soon an even grander ideal presented itself to him, and he saw that his priests must not be content with living in safety abroad, and waiting for the time of grace to dawn in England, but must be prepared like true apostles, to take their lives in their hands, and go back into this country to work in the Lord's vineyard, snatching souls from the jaws of heresy, and preaching the gospel of peace to those who were plunged in darkness. This great work was begun at Douay on Michaelmas Day, 1568. It was the beginning of what we may fitly call the first Oxford Movement. The names of those who first joined Allen may be briefly noted. They were, Richard Bristow, Fellow of Exeter, who became Prefect of Studies, Thomas Marshall, Fellow of New College, Edward Riden, Fellow of Exeter, and John White, afterwards D.D., while Morgan Philipps, Allen's own tutor at Oxford, came to reside in the college from its commencement, and was one of its earliest benefactors. The numbers of the college increased rapidly as its fame spread abroad, and soon Allen with the help of Gregory XIII. founded a Seminary on similar lines at Rome, the still existing and flourishing venerable English College.

The story has often been told of how the Seminaries founded by Allen quickly became seed-plots of martyrs, and how the zeal and the fortitude, the preaching and blood of the young men who poured forth from these Colleges to revive the Faith in England, triumphed over the cruellest persecutions, and kept alive the old religion at a time when the Government was doing its utmost to stamp it out. I need only here insist on the close union which ever existed between Oxford and Douay. We read, in the Chronicles of the University, that when the pestilence invaded Oxford, the students would migrate to some distant village, and there carry on their studies in safety, until the virulence of the plague was abated. And so we may say, may we not, that the true Oxford, the *major et sanior pars*, now migrated to Douay, and henceforth, for some generations at least, must be looked for there. Not in the Oxford of the days of

Elizabeth, with its Puritan tyranny, its neglect of learning, its contempt for the poor scholar, its ignorant hatred of the glories of the past, shall we find the University of St. Edmund Rich, Robert Grosseteste, Wykeham, and Wolsey ; but in the poor Colleges founded by the men who gave up their academical benefices, their dignities and wealth, for the sake of the old religion to which Oxford owed her very existence.

The first Chancellor of the new University of Douay was Dr. Richard Smith, of Merton, once Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford ; so that the University itself (it was founded in 1562) may be taken as the successor of Catholic Oxford.

And as we scan the lists of Allen's College, and read the names of Thomas Dorman, Fellow of All Souls, John Hawlet, Fellow of Exeter, Gregory Martin and Edmund Campion, Fellows of St. John's, John Hart, Thomas Ford, Fellow of Trinity, who are all numbered among the earliest comers, we feel that here indeed is the true Oxford, in exile, yes : in poverty, in want, but rich in the possession of the Faith.

And so began a steady stream of converts from Oxford, who slipped away from her deserted schools, and came to knock at Allen's doors. In 1574, we find twelve students coming in one ship, who at once applied themselves to theology, and at least six of these are known to have been from Oxford. Naturally such students "brought with them the traditions of English University and Collegiate life, and among these a high esteem for learning and a great respect for that which was still an external guarantee of learning, University degrees. So far as the means of the students or the common purse would allow, they did not fail to proceed to degrees at Douay or other foreign Universities. Thus, Blessed Cuthbert Mayne kept his first act for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity only seven days before he left Douay for the English Mission. In the College refectory, the doctors, assistants, and readers, sat at the President's table, and a double portion of food was set before them, and on certain days wine. Even among the doctors the strict order of precedence was observed, the Doctors of Divinity sitting above the Doctors of Laws. The writers of the College Diary in mentioning any graduate seldom failed to prefix to his name the mark of his degree, whether it be Doctor, Licentiate, or Master. So deeply rooted was this respect for degrees, that one cause of discontent among the students of the English College at Rome was that the Jesuit Rectors, even

those who were English, made no account of English academical degrees, but placed a graduate on no higher footing in the Seminary than one who had not been educated at the University." In 1574, the first priests were sent from the Douay Seminary to the English Mission. And thenceforth the English Government, in mingled consternation and rage, vowed war to the knife against Allen and his Oxford movement.

As Mr. Brodrick writes :

Among the causes which contributed to depress the intellectual life of Oxford, we must not omit to notice the withdrawal of many gifted scholars to seek liberty of conscience at the new Catholic Seminary of Douay. Leicester's agents were constantly on the watch against the reappearance of these "seminary priests" at Oxford with intent to Romanize the University, and this perhaps was no imaginary danger, but neither learning nor education flourished under Oxford Puritanism.

It would indeed be interesting to discover how many were the professors and students who returned by degrees to the Church of their fathers, how many zealous Protestants were converted by the Catholic books which were so assiduously distributed by zealous agents, but we can gain an idea of the strength of the movement, by the violence of the steps taken to suppress it, and above all to punish the booksellers who dared to circulate this forbidden literature. The case of Roland Jenks, the Oxford bookseller, is well known.

Wood writes of this good man with some asperity :

He made it also his chief employment to vilify that Government now settled, profane God's Word, speak evilly of the ministers and absent himself from the Church. . . . At length a Convocation of Doctors, Regents, and non-Regents being held May 1st, 1577, it was ordered that he should be seized on, and sent to London to be examined by the Chancellor of the University and the Queen's Council concerning his crimes. . . . After the said vote had passed in Convocation, Jenks was forthwith taken and conveyed away, his house searched for Bulls, libels, and such like things against the Queen and the religion now established, and all his goods seized on. But after he had been examined in London, he was sent to Oxford, again to be committed to prison, and stand to a trial the next Assizes following, and to receive that punishment or doom which the Judge should think equal to his crimes.

The Assizes therefore being come, which began the 4 July, and continued two days after in the Court-House at the Castle Yard, the said Jenks was arraigned and condemned in the presence of a great

number of persons to lose his ears. Judgment being passed and the prisoner taken away, there arose such an infectious damp or breath among the people, that many there present, to the apprehensions of most men, were then smothered, and others so deeply infected that they lived not many hours after. Of which passages, hear, I pray, what death partly says in a doleful ditty, that was published about this time :

Think you on the solemn Sizes past
How suddenly in Oxfordshire,
I came and made the Judges all aghast,
And Justices that did appear.

And took both *Bell* and *Barham* away
And many a worthy man that day
And all their bodies brought to clay.

The reference is to Sir Robert Bell, Baron of the Exchequer, and Sir Nicholas Barham, Sergeant-at-Law, who were both stiff enemies to the Catholic religion. There also were carried off the High Sheriff, Sir Robert Doiley, his Under-Sheriff, and six Justices of the Peace (among whom were a Fetyplace and a Harcourt), and hundreds of others; about 510 in all. The University was deserted, almost all the Heads of Houses fled, and there was general consternation.

The Puritans who now ruled Merton College inserted in the College Register, that the plague had been devised by the Roman Catholics, and that it sprang "*ex artificiosis, diabolicis, et plane Papisticis flatibus, e Lovainiensi bardthro excitatis, et ad nos clam emissis: i.e.,* from the artificial, diabolical, and truly Papistical blasts, stirred up from the abyss of Louvain and secretly wafted over to us." Others, however, saw in it a manifest judgment of God on the cruel persecution of the Catholics.

In 1578, the University amended its statutes for the quelling and abolishing of heretical pravity, which, as Wood pithily remarks, was now accounted Popery, though before it was Wicklivism. They ordered that the young men should read the following books in order to extirpate all heresy and to instruct them in true piety, the greater Catechism of Alexander Nowell, or that of John Calvin, or the *Elements of the Christian Religion* of Andreas Hyperius, or the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, as they preferred.

To these the more advanced were to add the *Catechesis* for adults of Henry Bullinger, the *Institutions* of Calvin, Jewel's

Apology, and the *Articles of Religion*. All other Catechisms and other superstitious and Popish books, such as had been circulated by Jenks, were most strictly forbidden. The tutors were to teach the approved works to their pupils in private, and a public catechist was to be appointed in every College and Hall. An examination was to be held in the Colleges by the catechist or the Head of the House, and at the end of each term the Vice-Chancellor and Professors of Divinity were to hold one in public; and anyone found guilty of negligence in these studies was to be corrected and punished.

Thus the pure Word of God was established in the University of Oxford, and as it was fondly hoped, Popery was for ever extirpated! We may note that among the catechists then appointed were divers zealous foreign divines, who thus carried on the traditions of Peter Martyr and Bucer. Among these heretics was Corrano, a Spaniard who lectured at Gloucester Hall, St. Mary's, and Hart Hall; a Frenchman called Rhegius or le Roi at Magdalen Hall, and another called de la Bensiris, for Broadgates Hall, and so on. These all lived comfortably at the expense of the University. The authorities, not content with having the undergraduates catechized and instructed in Protestantism ("which," says Wood, "were much disliked by some that durst not as yet contradict them"), began in 1580 to force them to attend constant sermons (which up to this time had been rare events for reasons already stated), and not only to attend them but to give an account of what they had heard to their tutors. "And all this was done that the Word of God (as they pretended), and Protestantism might increase, and Romanism decay." It is indeed curious to see that now, more than twenty years after the happy establishment of the new religion in the University, how terrible a bugbear Popery still was, and how strong in the hearts of the young, in spite of a cruel and ever-increasing persecution. Nor does it appear that the new departure in favour of constant sermons was altogether happy in its result, for there still being a great lack of suitable preachers, the work was undertaken by young men whose disorderly and violent discourses soon became such a scandal that Leicester, as Chancellor, had to interfere. He wrote that after having inquired into the matter and examined some of the preachers, "he did indeed find disorders such as grieved him to hear."

It was indeed difficult to root out the Catholic Faith from

the University. Even in 1581, the year of Blessed Edmund Campion's martyrdom, we find Leicester proposing new statutes in order to make it impossible for Catholics to come to Oxford or to remain there. He complained that owing to the carelessness of the Heads of Houses, many scholars had lived a long time at the University without ever taking the oath, "and by this means many Papists have heretofore and may hereafter lurk among you, and be brought up by corrupt tutors, neither yielding to God nor to her Majesty, or your University, their bounden duty, as hath of late years too much appeared, and is evident in sundry young students in your University, some being at Rome, some in the Seminaries and other places, all out of her Majesty's obedience."

In future then no scholar was to be admitted to any College or Hall, unless he had taken the Oath of the Queen's Supremacy, and subscribed the articles of religion; and no tutor was to be allowed to teach except with a license to be granted by the Vice-Chancellor, and three Doctors of Divinity.

And if it happen that there be not three Doctors or three Bachelors of Divinity in the town [they could easily have been found at Douay], then the Vice-Chancellor to take six Preachers, or for defect of them six Masters of Arts, professed students of Divinity, &c.

And

whereas there is an opinion conceived of many Papists being among you, as by my Lords of the Council's Letters upon occasion of the Seminary Priests hath been signified, I wish you hereafter not to tolerate or in any way to countenance such suspected persons among you.

The University dutifully fulfilled the behests of its sovereign master, but it does not appear that true religion or even morality gained much by the new enactments. At any rate, the next year we find Leicester bitterly complaining of the disorders and abuses tolerated in the University, the scandalous lives of the scholars, who seemed

to learn nothing else but to jelt in the streets and to tippie in taverns, returning to their friends less learned than when they came thither, and worse mannered than if they had been so long conversant among the worst sort of people. No [he goes on] this is not the old University order. And that may the old Popish times to no small note of ours testify, and the beginning of her Majesty's reign . . . when as myself can remember, none came hither to the Court out of the University, but decently apparelled and with the habit of his degree like a scholar, &c.

The stir caused in the University by the conversion of Edmund Campion, immediately after his year of Proctorship, was very great; and that caused by his return was even greater.

We may remember that the Oxford graduates and undergraduates who flocked to Lyford to see the famous Jesuit, were the indirect cause of his arrest and martyrdom, and we can imagine the sensation that filled the University, when on June 27, 1581, the benches of St. Mary's Church were found covered with copies of Campion's famous work, the *Decem Rationes*. They had been secretly placed there by a future martyr, the Ven. William Hartley, just before the University assembled to hear a sermon. The work was dated Cosmopolis 1581, and it set all Oxford on fire. The conflagration seems even to have spread to the sister University. In 1592, another Commission was appointed at Cambridge to search for Catholics who seduced the young men, mainly by distributing Popish literature, for it had been found by experience that it was far easier to burn the writings of Catholic controversialists than to refute them.

It is no surprise to find that when in 1578, owing to the machinations of the English Government, the College had to migrate for a time from Douay to Rheims, some sixty students followed Allen thither, most of whom were Oxford men. Indeed, if we analyze the list of the English Martyrs who suffered between the years 1570 and 1583, and who have now been beatified, we shall find that out of twenty-five no less than twelve were members of this University, and only one certainly, though probably two were Cambridge men. At least fifty of our martyrs studied at Oxford; and there is, I think, hardly one of the ancient Colleges or Halls of the University that has not produced at least one member of this glorious host.

Thus Balliol numbers among her sons Ven. Thomas Pilchard; Merton has Ven. John Sugar; Exeter, Blessed Ralph Sherwin; Oriel, Ven. Stephen Rowsham; Queen's, Ven. John Bost; New College, Ven. James Fenn, Ven. John Munday, Ven. John Body, and several others; Lincoln, Blessed William Hart and Blessed William Filbie; Magdalen, Blessed Thomas Abel; Brasenose, Blessed Thomas Cottam, S.J., Blessed John Shert, Blessed Lawrence Johnson; Corpus, Ven. George Napper; Christ Church, Ven. Thomas Hemerford and Ven. Robert Sutton; Trinity, Blessed Thomas Ford, and no less than seven

others ; St. John's, Blessed Edmund Campion, proto-martyr, S.J., Blessed Cuthbert Mayne, proto-martyr of the Seminary priests, and Ven. John Roberts, proto-martyr of the Benedictine revival ; Worcester, Ven. Richard Simpson ; Hertford (then Hart Hall), Blessed Alexander Bryant ; Pembroke (then Broadgates Hall), Blessed John Storey, its Principal ; St. Mary Hall, Ven. Thomas Anderton.

Thus we see that Mr. Gladstone, when he declared that the deepest and most vital religious influences at Oxford in the sixteenth century were addressed to the making of Catholic recusants, might well have added "and Catholic martyrs." And thus, too, it is clear that by God's goodness *Dominus illuminatio mea* was still in some sense the true device of Oxford, even in her darkest days.

That light that shone on William Allen and his Oxford disciples was one day to illuminate an even greater leader, himself a member of Allen's own College of Our Lady of Oriel, John Henry Newman. He, too, with a band of fervent disciples was to follow that light till it led him far from Oxford into a foreign land, even to the feet of the Vicar of Christ. And he too was to accomplish a mighty work for the recall of Oxford and of England to her ancient faith and to her ancient love. And in the end both were to be crowned by the solemn approbation of the Successor of Peter, both to be robed in the imperial purple of Rome's princes, Allen as Cardinal of St. Martin in Montibus, Newman as Cardinal of St. George in Velabro. Thus it was that from Oxford proceeded the two chief influences which have revived the faith of Christ in England when it seemed in imminent danger of decay and extinction. The methods of the Second Movement differed indeed from those of the first, but one and the same Spirit inspired and animated both of them. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

DOM BEDE CAMM.

The Bury Pageant.

To the lover of English architecture, history, religion, Bury St. Edmunds is holy ground—a name of pride, a name also of pain. To many a modern less concerned with these things, one chapter in its past has become familiar through Carlyle's delightful interpretation of Jocelin. July's Pageant will now have popularized its mediæval history among a wider public, and notably Bury's own townsfolk and neighbours, some two thousand of whom took part in the performance.

Among the many of the present year, this Pageant or "folk-play," stands out by reason not only of the dignity of the *locus in quo* (though here, no doubt, St. Albans is a serious rival), but in particular by its being the only one of them arranged and directed by Mr. Parker, the well-known originator of these spectacles, who introduced them two years since at Sherborne.

The better to appreciate the show, one must give a glance at the setting, must gain some notion of the past and present aspect of that great abbatial precinct—*sacrarium regis, cunabula legis*, round which the bygone story centred, and within whose gates to-day it was retold. As a Benedictine House of the first magnitude and importance, and as placed in that East Anglia which bore the very flower and aristocracy of English architecture—Lincoln's majestic trinity of steeples, Peterborough's solemn porticoes, Ely's lordly octagon and superb corona—Bury St. Edmunds must have shared to the full their splendid birthright. Leland, who could be critical, speaks enthusiastically of Bury: "On a fairer city the sun never shone; the monastery itself, indeed, might almost pass for a city . . . nothing could be more magnificent than the church," and so on. Little, alas, remains of these glories but the buildings of the western boundary, a mere outwork of the Abbey it is true, but one of exceptional beauty and extent, comprising as it does in its length, two noble fifteenth century churches, and a couple of Gate-towers respectively among the choicest examples of

Norman and Decorated Art. To the pilgrim passing of old within the former, would be immediately revealed the august fabric of the Abbey church, recalling in its main lines its sister of Ely—a mighty cliff of Norman walling crowned with lofty crests of Gothic tower. Within, a solemn avenue some five hundred feet long, vast and simple, with adjuncts of transept, crypt, and chapel, sheltered the Shrine of St. Edmund, with the numerous shrines and altars clustered round it, while spreading far to northward, monastic buildings on a corresponding scale gathered about the Great Cloister.

Here, then, amid the scanty ruins of these venerable splendours, and the green luxuriance of gardens public and private, the recent Pageant ran its course.

Were one, as a preliminary, to summarize the impressions of an exhibition lasting a full three hours, one would be safe in saying that for most spectators an initial disappointment with scenes somewhat scattered and ineffective, gradually vanished as the Episodes grew richer and fuller, till one was fairly carried away by the splendour and animation of the closing displays; while a Catholic could scarcely be surprised to find that, interesting as it all was as a picture of religio-political events, there was, in spite of good intentions, something wanting, something imperfectly grasped, on the religious side, in the *ethos*, the atmosphere, of the whole. To one who had seen the Sherborne show, there would occur sundry points of comparison. The scenes there presented dwell in memory as a series of striking tableaux rather than, as here, an open-air play with a voluminous *libretto*. And after all, in the open air it is really action and spectacle that tell; dialogue is at a disadvantage, and may weaken effect. There, too, a distinct gain was secured in the more considerable background of ancient ruin, giving scale and support, especially to the smaller groupings. On the other hand, the longer vistas and wider expanses at Bury needed and gave scope for such incidents as the dramatic entry of Boadicea in her flying chariot, the helter-skelter of the breathless horseman bringing news of the Papal Interdict, the wild onset of armed and mounted men, the stately cavalcades of knights and nobles and royal personages. One excellent feature of both displays was the absence of any intermission in their action. Each Episode comprised a variety of scenes, but the connection was never broken, or at all events the arena was never empty, while the intervals between the

Episodes themselves were effectively occupied by the Chorus. Recurrent music indeed considerably enhanced the programme.

It was natural, after all, that the earlier and simpler and more conjectural scenes should be pictorially less striking. But the inevitable guesswork was not always successful in its effects, and it seemed to one, in particular, that the personality and *entourage* of Edmund, King and Martyr, were scarcely "realized." From this point, however, his influence was felt throughout the piece, and later visibly expressed by the solemn installation of his Shrine and Banner as permanent features—the Palladium of the display. It was escorted to its place by a really fine procession of chanting monks and choristers, King and Queen and knight and dame, the hymn itself being taken from the old Abbey psalter.

The dominating personality of the whole performance, with an Episode to himself, was, naturally enough, the famous Abbot Samson, excellently rendered by it said (if an open anonymity may be disclosed) by the resident Archdeacon. The upright, sagacious, combative, yet not unkindly character drawn for us in the pages of Jocelin, palpably took hold of the audience, and his passing from the earthly scene was a pathetic moment. The somewhat secular presentment of the Abbot and his convent, saving some gratuitous clownishness on the part of the monks, followed the original pretty closely. Jocelin of Brakelond was not a chronicler of spirituals. He shows us, chiefly, Samson the administrator and reformer, immersed in the duties and disputes of a great feudal position, and the regulation of a large community not always amenable. But this side of mediæval monasticism would, in a perfect picture, have been balanced by the introduction of less lively but more normal scenes from the daily life of the cloister or the regular functions of the Church. We might, too, appropriately have had, if not less of the King, a little more of the Pope. We might even have been permitted to see Samson himself on that visit of his early days to Rome. A scene at the Papal Court would have been immensely effective, to say nothing else.

It could scarcely be expected, perhaps, that a panoramic view covering some thousand years should exhibit no anachronisms, at least in accessories. But the scenes claimed to be typical rather than strictly realistic, and convention, æsthetic and dramatic, has to be allowed for. It seems questionable, how-

ever, whether this can be held to cover the habitual representation of Abbot Samson and other prelates in chasubles, or the liberty of ecclesiastical colours observed in certain scenes. The large and elaborate banner of St. Edmund, carefully copied from a late mediæval source, was a most interesting production, absolutely in character with the later Episodes, but post-dated by some centuries at the time of its first appearance on the scene. As in the case of the Shrine, there should have been an earlier and a later one. The great golden Shrine itself was well conceived on the whole, and if for its complement of statuettes a "Catholic Repository" was raided, so that a Lourdes Madonna and a modern St. Joseph were to be found adorning this Norman reliquary—well, the fact was not apparent at a correct distance! On the other hand, the choir-stalls, which formed so conspicuous a part of the properties (stage scenery there was practically none), were unfortunately a complete caricature. The short Magna Charta Episode (less impressive, perhaps, than it might have been), and the sumptuous series of scenes founded on a condensation of Shakespeare's "King Henry VI.," gave evidence of much careful study of costume and accessories, material, of course, being much more detailed and abundant. And here and hereafter one had good opportunity for noting the importance of apparel, whether to the individual or to the mass. It was difficult to reconcile oneself to some of the later and more fantastic fashions in masculine wear, but the surprising grace of female attire in the various periods convinced one that, if a fair woman would look her fairest, she must don the habiliments of the middle ages. Children, both boys and girls, from the era of skins to the era of silks and slashings, looked admirably well and natural.

The last Episode, showing the transition to the New Age, was the occasion for a display of cumulative splendours on a really magnificent scale. Group succeeded group, incident jostled incident, in bewildering variety; picturesque and splendid throngs streamed in from every point of the ground—royal and noble personages with their retinues, townsfolk and countryfolk, the Bury guilds with their banners (of great interest and obvious authenticity), stall-holders of the fair, morris-dancers, scholars, real grammar-scholars—till the whole wide arena became alive, one throbbing mass of colour and movement, varied, mingled, and harmonized with all the arts of stagecraft. Presently the gay crowd parts asunder; a silence falls upon

it, broken by sympathetic murmurs as down the pathway through its midst comes a mournful train of Black Monks, vanishing, as Shrine and Banner have already vanished, from our ken. Then, after an Elizabethan scene, came the final chorus hymning St. Edmund, who reappears in the background, exalted on a pedestal. Nor was this the conclusion—there was yet to come the March-Past, when the whole two thousand performers, horse and foot, in due sequence of incident, form up in the arena, circle round, and march out, leaving one with the sense of having passed through a remarkable and indeed somewhat overpowering experience. One scenic element, it must be confessed, the Pageant lacked, which no effort, however, could have supplied. Not once that afternoon did Leland's sunshine visit St. Edmundsbury, and one was left to imagine what fresh lustre it could have shed upon all that brilliancy; just as on the downward journey one had been left to wonder what keener brightness it could have struck from those fields and patches of intense saffron which chequer the grey-green expanses of the stretching Fenland.

W. RANDOLPH.

The Story of a Conversion.

IN the last month of last year a sensational surprise was caused in French literary circles by the news that Adolphe Retté, a prominent "devourer of priests" and a leader of the irreligious movement, had become converted to the Catholic truth. The event gave great consolation to many Catholics in that trying time, to none more than J. K. Huysmans, who was justifying fully the sincerity of his own conversion by a patient and most exemplary endurance of the long and painful illness which carried him off last May. Retté had been among the foremost of those who attacked with blasphemous abuse the defection of Huysmans from the anti-Christian ranks. After his conversion, by the advice of his friends, Retté retired for a time to write a book of confessions describing the journey he had just made from atheism to belief, or as he somewhat sensationally describes it, from the Devil to God.¹ That this work of expiation has been widely read is evidenced by the fact that it has already reached its twelfth edition. It is a book of striking interest. Its author is not one of those who, like the late F. Brunetière or Paul Bourget, has returned to the Church of his infancy after a long neglect of its creed and practice. On the other hand, the Catholic faith which he now embraces with such enthusiasm is the only faith he has ever known. Orphaned at an early age, he was left to the chances of the world. The Protestantism which he learned at College was never a personal religion to him, and a life of debauchery soon effaced whatever fragments of Christianity had filtered into his life. He became a soldier, then a journalist, and in the latter capacity the work which he took upon himself was the extirpation of religion and moral ideas from the youth of France. But Divine grace was seeking him, though he knew it not; it pursued him later even when he knew it and fled from it. The struggle and the victory form the theme of his fascinating book.

¹ *Du Diable à Dieu. Histoire d'une Conversion.* Paris: Vanier.

It may be that Catholics have learnt by experience to distrust what may be called artistic or literary conversions. Most of us have known cases in which sentiment has led people into the Church, and then either fading away, or turning in another direction, has led them forth again. Nevertheless, there is no need for us to be too cynical if we bear in mind that a conversion, while it is the end of a psychological stage and the culmination of a process, is from another point of view the beginning of a new period in which grace and nature are destined to play their part. We may rejoice in a conversion with that hopeful joy with which the crowds cheer the launching of a ship that comes newly-made from the building yard, with every promise of a successful passage over the perilous ocean.

The book before us centres round a poet. Yet the description it contains is not in the first place that of the conversion of a poet, but that of a sinner. The convert, as we might expect, expresses himself in the terms of his own art, he uses poetical language, he has pages of "fine writing," but for all that, he leaves the impression that in the Church he has found, not merely the satisfaction of his æsthetic instincts, but refuge and relief from the corruption and slavery of iniquity. He gives thanks, not because God has given him the grace of artistic "self-realization," but because his Creator has dragged him "from the way of eternal damnation."

His disappointments, his disillusion, his remorse have brought him "unto this Peace." Stately ritual, appealing liturgy, the majestic chant of sonorous Latin have had nothing to do with the change in him. Not in the midst of splendid ceremonial, nor in the retired solemnity of abandoned churches has he found the faith, but in the forests with the panorama of nature, its sounds and its silences, his mind has learnt to step upwards towards the sanctuary, *ubi habitat justitia*, where righteousness has her dwelling.

The scene opens in a third-rate *café* at Fontainebleau. Retté has just finished a socialistic harangue before an audience of working-men. These have filed out, full of the Utopian ideas he has been developing. A small group remain behind with the orator and gather round a table with their beer-bottles before them. In that damp, cramped, half-lighted room, reeking with tobacco smoke, the workmen begin to occupy themselves with the deep problem of the age—with science and religion. They wish to consult their oracle as to the beginning of all things. There is

no good God, the world has had no Creator, and as science knows everything, the gardener who was one of the party wishes to know "how the universe made a start."

It was a simple question, that of the gardener, but the answer did not come readily. The workmen waited with ears pricked, and wide eyes to hear what science had to say for itself. Retté looked into the faces of these poor fellows, and watched their blank disappointment and dissatisfaction when, after a silence, he answered that science had nothing to declare on that subject. They evidently felt defrauded, and one of them made himself their spokesman, and told him so. He hesitated, and began to unpack the usual baggage—the theories which he felt to be quite beside the point, of evolution, materialism, determinism. Not only during that restless night, but for many nights the question he had been so powerless to answer, presented itself to him, not as a mere speculative problem, but as a doubt introducing itself into the very foundations of his philosophy. He had been posing as a guide and teacher, he had reared imposing edifices, whose harmonies and grandeur awakened his own enthusiasm, and that of the public for which he wrote. The world of his philosophy was self-sufficient, driving itself forward towards its own perfection. It was time for Humanity to look for the speedy coming of the Age of Gold. This was the stately edifice of hope he had been building, with its towers in the clouds. But what of its foundations? It became plainer and plainer on reflection that it was built upon a shifting sandbed. And those poor fellows to whom he had been an Evangelist and a Prophet, that crowd of grown-up children, hard-worked, so thirsty for certainties, so undisciplined and easily duped—how dare he unfold to them that empty, idle dream, that Apocalypse of mingled science and unreason? Already he had abandoned the Anarchism which had been his first ideal, as something both hideous and visionary. He was beginning now to suspect that the theory of revolutionary socialism had no better foundations. His experience of the men who were presiding over the destinies of France, had caused him many a sad disillusionment. Some genuine patriots there were among them, but on the whole he had found them a gang of self-interested politicians, party-mongers, pseudo-scientific plagiarists, windy orators, all driving the country in their own way to a state in which every stable element would be dissolved. For a time Clemenceau had been a prophet in his eyes. He

became acquainted with him at the time when the politician-journalist was retrieving, slowly indeed, the prestige he had lost during the Panama discussions. Retté's description of him is particularly interesting now that he has attained to his present commanding, if somewhat precarious, supremacy.

This man exercises a strange fascination. It is all the more difficult to understand it, because hard, sarcastic, often insulting, he treats with brutality those who admire him and court his friendship. Perhaps his power over cultivated minds comes from his strong intelligence, his genuine taste and real understanding in matters of art, and again from a comparison which one is obliged to make between the quality of his mind and the stupidity of the radical gang. Again, like all commanding temperaments, he dominates you by the authority of his manner. He is a Jacobin, but a well-educated one, a type by no means common.

But to return. In the strife of political factions, in the ferment of his social ideas, Retté had experienced a disappointment, both with men and systems which had prepared the way for the mental struggle which was to follow the incident of the Fontainebleau *café*. His moral training had been totally neglected, he had had no sense of discipline instilled into him by early education; his passions ran wild. A woman, too, ruled him with a lawless, sensual sway, of which he frequently tried to rid himself—not from any scruple of conscience, but because her lying, her ill-temper, and her intemperance added to the miseries of a hard-earned and laborious existence. Yet, though he despised her, and perpetually quarrelled with her, her fascination would reassert itself, and leave him powerless to dismiss her. This mistress (though fortunately she does not appear prominently in his confessions) bound him, throughout his struggle for his soul, to every element that was base in his ideals and that was lawless and outrageous in his conduct. His only consolations were his art and the forest which he loved. Whenever it was possible he lived away from the city at Fontainebleau. He loved the open air. Removed from the company of self-seeking publicists and from the wretchedness of his home, his delight was to wander in the woods, composing his verses, and reciting them to himself, acquainting himself with all the moods of nature, whose companionship seemed to provide an anodyne for the cares and disappointments of life.

Without this love of solitude with which God has been pleased to endow me from my childhood, I do not know what would have become

of me. For, it is worthy of note, that at all times in my life, I have only felt happy in solitude in the fields, under the trees, or near the water's edge. To dream, to meditate silently upon some landscape, such have been my deepest and my most salutary pleasures. I have felt this on days when after heaping sin upon sin I have fled to a spot so retired that the pack of my passions could scarcely be let loose on me.

It was to seek the distraction of the woods that he went, one June morning in 1905, into the forest after a week of frightful dissipation. He carried with him the *Divine Comedy* to while away the time. He had always regarded it as a beautiful fairy tale, set into poetry by the genius of Dante. He began to read the second canto of the *Purgatorio*, where the poet sings of the advent of the Angel's boat to the shore of Purgatory—drifting without oars towards the place of purification.

Upon the stem stood the Celestial pilot,
Beatitude seemed written in his face;
And more than a hundred spirits sat within
"In exitu Israel de Egypto!"
They chanted all together with one voice,
And whatso in that psalm is after written.¹

The words came to him as a message of grace. As he read them a shudder passed over him. He trembled from head to foot. Remorse and unspeakable joy overflowed into his soul. The faith of Dante was challenging him to lay down the weight of his sins and to begin with sweat and labour, yet with desire to climb the terraces of purification.

The impression of grace, vivid as it was, quickly faded. That very afternoon one of his literary friends called on him and proposed a walk round the *château*. During the course of their conversation, this friend confided to Retté his dissatisfaction with the scientific irreligion that was beginning to lose his adhesion. Christianity had presented itself to his mind as a possible solution of his doubts and disturbance. Retté was astounded. It was as if this man was a living replica of his own troubled self. Here was a great opportunity. But the evil spirit rose in him, and he answered the doubts of his friend by a litany of cultured blasphemy, a panegyric of Greek polytheism, and an outrageous quotation from one of his own poems, in which the Blessed Virgin was reviled.

His friend was shaken by this torrent of words, and before

¹ *Purgatorio*, canto ii. (Longfellow's translation.)

he left, Retté had supplied him with a list of books which were calculated to counteract his rising Christian tendencies. From this time, however, it is evident that the struggle which was being enacted in his soul, entered upon a more definite stage. Dante had given him a glimpse, not only of Christian penance, but also of Catholic Faith.

He perceived that the path of his salvation lay in the direction of the Catholic Church. Soon we find this thought taking form in his meditations. He went early one morning to his beloved forest to think out his position, and this was the form in which his hitherto vague gropings towards the Good took coherent shape.

From the day when men first asked themselves the question why were we put into the world, a hundred religions and as many philosophies have attempted to answer it. Their solutions have been various, according to the surroundings, the circumstances, the fashions, and above all the caprices of the human mind. Beliefs have been born, have developed, and have perished. Reason and science have exerted themselves to give an explanation of the universe. Never have they succeeded in establishing anything, since a theory that was held yesterday as a truth is replaced by a new hypothesis to-day, and this will be ousted to-morrow by another conjecture. That is the experience of all time. But it must be acknowledged that in the midst of this perpetual flux, the Catholic Church alone remains immovable. Its dogmas have existed since its foundation. They can be found in substance in the Gospels. Since then the Apostles and the Fathers have done nothing more than develop and strengthen them, framing out of them a liturgy and a discipline. Meanwhile, scholars and philosophers have given themselves over to continual disputes, and heretics have never ceased to rend themselves into a multitude of sects, in which each interprets God in his own fashion. For nineteen centuries this has been going on. The Church maintains its belief intact, while around it doctrines and theories whirl round like dead leaves blown about by a cyclone.

Then meditating on his own unhappy country, Retté opened his eyes to the state of misery to which the eighteenth century philosophy, and its practical application during the Revolution had reduced it. Ideals, religion, the safeguards of civic and family life had been thrown into the melting-pot. But what had taken their place? Anarchy and disruption were rife, and the Age of Gold promised and prophesied by the sentimentalists seemed as far off as ever it was.

"What did Balzac conclude from it all? Nothing short of

this: that the Church, which has remained unshaken, is alone capable of lighting a beacon whose brightness would avail to lead through this fog the strayed and drifted vessels." He was only affirming a truth which the Church had never tired of proclaiming from the beginning, that outside of her no salvation could be found.

We find our poet in the March of 1906 leaving his forest retreat for the capital, which, in spite of some compensations, he heartily loathed. He was accompanied thither by "the lady with dark eyes"—his evil genius. There he was confronted with another set-back to his progress, which might have kept him in his misery for ever. The extremists whom he had served by his pen were in power, and hard at work at their business of severing the Church from the State. Clemenceau had recovered his ascendancy. There was question of providing Retté with a reward for faithful service in the past by appointing him to a sinecure in some department of the State. He had for a long time despised the *Bloc* in his heart, but the evil spirit whispered there were many others who did so, and who yet did not scruple to make a good living out of it for all that. One hypocrite more or less, he reasoned, would make no great difference. He soon felt, however, that too much hypocrisy was demanded of him by these masters.

One evening he was present at a council of conspiring politicians, presided over by a man who was wont, in his speeches and articles, to make a brave parade of his fairness and tolerance. There were some present at the meeting who, taking him too literally perhaps, were complaining of the delays in forwarding the policy of complete separation of Church and State, with its programme of despoiling the secular clergy and silencing Catholic worship throughout France. "Give us time, we will quietly strangle the priests, without ceasing to talk of liberty, and better than that, we will manage to represent to the country that they were the first to begin the mischief." This cynical avowal of what the world now knows to have been the deliberate policy of the *Bloc* filled him with loathing. His temptation to sell himself to the party vanished then, and never returned to him.

He broke off his connection too at this period with the anticlerical press. Once indeed he departed from grace in this matter by writing an article holding up to ridicule the cultus of the Blessed Virgin as it appears in Huysmans' last book, *Les*

foules de Lourdes. But this fall was occasioned, it would appear, rather by want of money than by an acute return of irreligion. He paid the price of this relapse by an anguish of conscience, which returned to him at intervals to the very time of his final conversion.

So far, we may have noted it, he has kept his mental disquiet to himself. He has unburdened his soul to no one, and endured his agony alone. But now he breaks silence. François Coppée, a friend of many years' standing and unfailing kindness, a man too of the same profession as himself, is made his confidant. His self-revelation was by no means complete, even now he was held back from making a full disclosure of his religious conflict. Coppée was sympathetic with him, "like an indulgent big brother," and it was to him that he applied before long for a letter of introduction to some priest who should instruct him and receive him into the Church.

The last phase was upon him. We need not follow its details: for it is the old duel between flesh and spirit which is familiar to us in the ancient pages of St. Augustin:

I was sick and tormented, reproaching myself more bitterly than ever, rolling and writhing in my chain till it should be utterly broken, for at present, though all but snapped, it held me tight. And Thou, O Lord, wast in my inmost heart urging with austere pity, the scourge of fear and shame, lest I should fail once more, and the rest of my worn and slender fetter, instead of breaking, should again grow strong and bind me faster than before. For I kept saying within myself, "Let it be now, let it be now," and as I spoke the word I was on the very verge of resolve: I was about to act, yet I did not act. Still, I did not step back into my former indifference, but stood close and took fresh breath. I tried again, and came a little and a little closer, I could all but touch and attain to the winning post. Yet I did not quite touch it, or reach it, because I still shrank from dying unto death and living unto life, and what was worse in me was stronger because it was ingrained, and what was better in me was yet untrained. And the moment which was to make me different affrighted me more the nearer it drew, but it no longer repelled or daunted, it only chilled me.¹

"The cloud of memories"—past sins, present weakness, shame, human respect, bore down upon Retté. The unworthiness and the fascination of his female companion deepened his melancholy and retarded his advance. Yet he was advancing. He took the weapon of prayer, he gained a settled conviction

¹ *Conf. lib. viii.*

of the Providence of God, he invoked the Blessed Virgin. The Christian that had been born in him began to grow strong, the old pagan in him was slowly dying. The crisis which decided all was more lurid than that of the great African's conversion. The woman had been dismissed, and temptation from that source was removed. Then a spiritual abandonment settled down upon him like a dark cloud. The vast serenity of the forest now gave him no consolation. The forces of evil gathered for their last assault. Under stress of this terrible melancholy, fatigued as he was by the long continual strain, he listened to the tempter who counselled suicide. He was preparing to make away with himself when the great grace came, this time overpowering, compelling. So plain was its call that he knew that God was saving him from bodily and from spiritual death. The rest is a familiar tale—edifying, but unexciting. François Coppée is the Catholic friend who introduces him to a priest. Retté finds the old Abbé at St. Sulpice very kind and sympathetic. He learns to make the sign of the Cross, and is instructed in the Creed. He prays in the churches, he makes his confession, and receives his first Communion.

Then he departs from Paris to Arbonne, in his favourite forest to write his book of thanksgiving and expiation. It is probable we shall hear of him again before long, for it is reported that he intends to publish his first volume of Christian poems. He is anxious to devote his talent to the cause he once attacked, and to aid in bringing back his unhappy country to a better mind. There is no want of scope for his talent, for, Heaven knows, religion in France has urgent need of able and courageous defenders.

DELTA.

Mr. McKenna's anti-Conscience Clauses.

A NEW and very serious phase has arisen in the crisis through which our Catholic schools are passing, and it is important that we should be prepared to meet it with an energetic and united resistance. It is indeed difficult to keep this spirit of resistance in full vigour when the assault is prolonged, and one hears from time to time Catholics declaring that they have had enough of the School Question, and are now sick of it. Of course it is the arm-chair combatants who are most prone to counsel surrender in the interests of personal quietude; such a disposition is inconceivable in the priests and teachers, or in parents who, like those brave fellows in the Low Valley, care deeply for the souls of their children, and realize the gravity of the spiritual danger impending over them. These are still boiling over with an indignation with which their oppressors will have to count. But it is well that we should remind ourselves from time to time that we must not allow our patience to be tired out, as long as the injustice continues, or continues to threaten. We must be persistent in reminding one another of the nature of this injustice, of the aggravating circumstances connected with it, of the absolute emptiness of all that our adversaries have ever ventured to urge in defence of their oppressions. We must be persistent in spreading the knowledge of the true facts among our own people, of whom many are still very ignorant of them, and among the fair-minded non-Catholics, so numerous in the country, who, if they fail to support our claims, fail only because they have not yet realized the true meaning and tendency of the measures of the present Government. We must be persistent too in showing our teeth, in every legitimate way, as we did so well a year ago, by the splendid meetings held so unitedly and enthusiastically in every part of the country. There is surely some encouragement to us to persevere in this path in the consciousness that our action shook the country out of some

of its delusions, and at the time took a good deal of the heart out of the party which was clamouring for our extinction in the schoolroom.

There is encouragement too in the proofs we get from time to time that our arguments have brought conviction and elicited acknowledgments from quarters whence we had least reason to expect them. Mr. Birrell, when he brought in the Bill of 1906, did not appear to appreciate the justice of our insistence on Catholic atmosphere. He knew we did insist on it, but evidently thought it was unreasonable of us. But the other day, in the debate on the Irish Catholic University question, he used language which ought not to be forgotten.¹

Some persons [he said] had spoken as if the dislike to Trinity College was confined to Catholics. He was bound to say that during the time he had had some personal opportunity of making himself acquainted with the subject he had found the dislike of the Presbyterians for Trinity College was expressed with far greater bitterness, much more vehemence, and more personal feeling than any he had heard from the mouths of Roman Catholics. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, it must be said that Trinity College had completely failed to meet the wants of Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. . . . They had had from the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Balfour) and from a great number of persons on his side of the House, including the right hon. gentleman, the member for the University of Dublin, a full recognition that it was not to be wondered at that the Roman Catholics of Ireland were not willing to send their sons to Trinity College as it was at present constituted, or as there was any chance of its being constituted. That opened up a question he was ill-qualified to discuss, and for the discussion of which he did not think that House was the proper place; that was to say, the question of the natural and proper anxiety parents might feel when selecting a place for the college education of their sons. Some people, no doubt, might think lightly of the matter. Some people might think that provided only a boy went to a college where there was a healthy, manly life, where he was taught to tell the truth and take his own part and obey his tutors, within reason (laughter), was brought up according to the religion of the place and came out a straightforward man—well, they might feel that “in my Father’s house are many mansions,” and it might well be that he would not come to any harm hereafter because of the atmosphere of the place.

That is no doubt the view taken by a considerable section of English parents, and it was well to state it, as its existence in the minds of this section is what predisposes them so strongly

¹ See *Times* for July 5th.

to worship the ideal of a homogeneous school and university system throughout the country, and to push aside with irritation as contentious and unreasonable the claims for separate treatment of Catholics and others. But Mr. Birrell in this speech showed himself more discriminating and hence more just.

But they could not expect deeply religious people, be they Catholics or be they Presbyterians, to regard with such composure the character of the place to which they sent their sons. If a man was of opinion that the character of religious faith was of the utmost importance, they could not expect him to be otherwise than anxious as to the character of the place he was sending his son to. Suppose it were not religion. Suppose it were a question of fiscal reform (laughter), and suppose there were in Ireland an active, eager, and zealous tariff reformer, and he was anxious to send his son to a place where political economy and other subjects were properly taught—would he send his son to an institution built up on the traditions of free trade, where all the professors were free-traders, where the one place of adornment in the school—he must not call it a chapel—the place where the lectures on political economy were delivered, was the centre of free-trade principles, and round the base of the dome of which some such words as these were inscribed, “No tax shall be levied save for purposes of revenue alone”? (Loud laughter.) He wondered whether such a father would be easily satisfied with the assurances of the professors that there were no tests whatever in that place, that everybody was at liberty to hold any kind of opinion in political economy he liked. He would say, “That won’t do for me. The whole tone and spirit of the place are based on free trade, all the professors are free-traders, and I find even the professor of Arabic is a free-trader. (Laughter.) The whole tone of the place for three hundred years past has been that of free trade.” I think that father would take away his children, Joseph Chamberlain and Henry Chaplin (loud laughter), from that place and would seek some other place where he could send them and where their economical faith would not be interfered with. (Cheers.) He said that simply because he did think it was desirable to change, as it were, the venue, and to look at this matter not purely from a religious point of view, but from any point of view which seriously engaged the thoughts and attentions of mankind. (Cheers.)

He said, therefore, he entirely agreed with the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition, who in a remarkable letter which he wrote on January 23, 1899, said: “At this moment the vast majority of students in that great University are Protestants; Protestant services are exclusively performed in its chapel; at this moment, as it happens, the whole of its teaching staff is Protestant, and the eminent theologian who is at its head, distinguished in many departments of learning, is

not least distinguished as a brilliant Protestant champion in the controversy between Protestantism and Rome." Now, imagine a University of which this was an accurate description, with the single exception that wherever the word "Protestant" occurred the words "Roman Catholic" were put in its place. Would you willingly send there any Protestant youth for whose education you were responsible? For myself, I answer the question unhesitatingly in the negative. Perhaps I am bigoted, but if so I am assured that there are many Protestant parents to be found not less bigoted in Ireland. To them, at least, I can confidently appeal not to condemn others for doing what they, under like circumstances, would do themselves.

The Irish Catholics could not themselves have stated more exactly or more cogently the grounds of their claim for Catholic atmosphere, and Mr. Birrell is to be commended also for the spirit of conciliation and inquiry with which he desires to approach the undoubtedly difficult problem of satisfying those "of opinion that the character of religious faith is of the utmost importance," and at the same time allaying the hostility of the Orangemen. The Catholic University question, he said, was not a popular one.

It shattered the great Administration of Mr. Gladstone; it divided the Tory party into two ranks, just as they were divided on the question of Catholic emancipation. It was, therefore, a vexed question, a difficult question, a question which a cautious man would, as far as possible, abstain from having anything to do with. But he connected himself with it; he associated himself with it, and he had no other desire than to pass the measure through the House. (Cheers.) He hoped that during the autumn he would be able to approach it. There was no hardship in passing one's autumn in Ireland. (Laughter.) He would just as lief spend it there as anywhere else, and he only hoped that it would be a longer autumn than the last. During that time he would certainly welcome all the help he could get from any one—he cared not who—in order to secure a solution of the question—a solution which would enable the vast majority of the people, being good and faithful Roman Catholics, to receive an education within the walls of a University where they could be sent by their fathers and mothers and by the priests of their religion, with at least confidence that they would be taught nothing destructive of their religious belief.

Mr. Birrell was not referring to the English school system when he enunciated these sound and statesmanlike principles. But he is too acute not to perceive that they are just as applicable to the English as to the Irish question. If the people who think one religion is as good as another "could not expect

deeply religious people, be they Catholics or Presbyterians, to regard with such composure the character of the (University) to which they sent their sons," neither can it be expected that the Catholics in England will view with composure the character of the Elementary School, or Pupil Teachers' Centre, or Training College, to which they are expected to send their children. Indeed, it must be expected that, conscious how much more helpless are children than young men in protecting themselves against the influences of an injurious atmosphere, they will view the character of these latter institutions with even less composure, and will say, "That won't do for me. The whole tone and spirit of the place are based on Protestantism, the teachers are either Protestant or Indifferentists, some of them even fanatical Protestants or concealed or aggressive Atheists." They might even point, as still more disturbing to their composure, to the conception of a teacher's office which they find set forth in the New Regulations of the Board of Education for the present year. For among the Regulations for Public Elementary Schools they find such passages as these:

Though their opportunities are brief, the teachers can yet do much to lay the foundations of conduct. They can endeavour, by example and influence, aided by the sense of discipline which should pervade the school, to implant in the children habits of industry, self-control, and courageous perseverance in the face of difficulties; they can teach them to reverence what is noble, to be ready for self-sacrifice, and to strive their utmost after purity and truth; they can foster a strong sense of duty, and instil in them that consideration and respect for others which must be the foundation of unselfishness and the true basis of all good manners; while the corporate life of the school, especially in the play-ground, should develop that instinct for fair-play and for loyalty to one another which is the germ of a wider sense of honour in later life.¹ . . .

And again:

Moral Instruction should form an important part of the curriculum of every elementary school. Such instruction may either (1) be incidental, occasional, and given as fitting opportunity arises in the ordinary routine of lessons, or (2) be given systematically and as a course of graduated instruction. The instruction should be specially directed to the inculcation of courage; truthfulness; cleanliness of mind, body, and speech; the love of fair-play; gentleness to the weaker; kindness to animals; temperance, self-denial, love of one's

¹ *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1907, p. 1.*

country, and appreciation of beauty in nature and in art. The teaching should be brought home to the children by reference to their actual surroundings in town and country, and should be illustrated as vividly as possible by stories, poems, quotations, proverbs, and examples drawn from history and biography. The object of such instruction being the formation of character and habits of life and thought, an appeal should be made to the feelings and personalities of the children. Unless the natural moral responsiveness of the child is stirred no moral instruction is likely to be fruitful.¹

And in the Regulations for the Training of Teachers they read that

Throughout the training it should be remembered that the function of the College in relation to the students is the formation of character no less than the giving of practical or intellectual instruction.

And again, that

It is important, in the first place, that the student should be brought to understand what Education in the fullest sense implies, by how many channels, consciously or unconsciously, the influence of the teacher acts upon the pupil, that the teacher's work, whether he intends it or not, has its relation to the child's whole being, and that all the powers of the teacher's nature, and not merely his intellectual powers, have their part to play in the education of the child.

All admirable words in themselves, these Catholic parents would rightly feel, and such as show a due appreciation of the far-reaching and deep-penetrating influence on character which a sound conception of the teacher's office involves; such, too, as show a due appreciation of the powerful influence of atmosphere, in moulding a pupil's mental and moral formation. Perhaps, indeed, such Catholic parents might also reflect on the contrast between the ideal of a child's formation thus portrayed, and the complaints they not seldom hear from Protestant neighbours who prefer for their children the atmosphere of a Catholic school just because it furnishes a fuller devotedness on the part of the teachers, and results in better "manners" on the part of the children. But what these Catholic parents must most of all feel is that, if their children are to be delivered over into the keeping (which is the entire keeping, in the case of a Residential School), of teachers and superintendents not of their own faith, it is true, in a very important sense, to say that for them the better the system propounded in the Regulations works the

¹ *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools*, pp. 3, 4.

worse it works. The Regulations say justly that "the teacher's work, whether he intends it or not, has its relation to the child's whole being," and that correlatively "all the powers of the teacher's nature, and not merely his intellectual powers, have their part to play in the education of the child;" but (the Catholic parents would say) these sound principles when applied to an undenominational system cannot but work out with the grossest unfairness. When it is question of a teacher coming in from without to give lessons on some special subjects, such as drilling, or drawing, or hygiene, the religious question does not arise, as then there is nothing to require that these visiting teachers should draw upon the whole of their personality. But with teachers who are to educate as well as instruct, to form mind and heart, as well as eye and finger, the religious question cannot be kept out, for the simple reason that a teacher's religious or anti-religious, Catholic or anti-Catholic convictions or opinions, form an important part, indeed, far the most important part, in his entire personality; and inevitably, whether he wishes it or not, is conscious of it or not, he must draw upon all these, if he would strive to be earnest and devoted in forming the character of his pupils. Thus, if he is Catholic, or Anglican, or Baptist, or undogmatic Christian, or pagan, he must either strive to impart the corresponding formation to his children, or else suppress the chief element in his personality, and with it his earnestness, in which case there must be a corresponding deficiency of results in the formation of his pupils. In short, the system to enforce which throughout the country all the powers of the State are being applied, is one admirably calculated to manufacture a generation of more or less educated young pagans, but very ill calculated to permit of the survival of educated young Catholics, still less of educated young dogmatic Protestants. This is what Catholic parents feel, and this is why they resent so indignantly the attempt to close their Catholic schools, and drive their children into so-called undenominational institutions.

Mr. Birrell has now acknowledged that, in taking up this position, they are not acting unintelligibly or without cogent motives; nor can we doubt that were he still at the Education Office he would apply his mind as diligently as he proposes to do in Ireland, to seek for a "solution which would enable the Catholics (and other varieties of deeply religious

people) to receive an education within the walls of schools where they could be sent by their fathers and mothers and by the priests of their religion, with at least a confidence that they would be taught nothing destructive of their religious belief." Nor in taking such a course would he perhaps be breaking with his own antecedents. At least it was very generally felt at the time that his Bill of last year was not uninfluenced by this kind of desire, and contained in itself the elements of a satisfactory solution; and might even have been purged of the defects which made it hopeless, had he been able to overcome in the intra-Cabinet controversies. Unfortunately we have now not Mr. Birrell but Mr. McKenna to deal with, and his public utterances have been the reverse of comforting, and quite devoid of that spirit of statesmanlike discernment which is so conspicuous in the recent utterances of his predecessor. We have no wish to misjudge Mr. McKenna, and we believe that he has no particular desire to oppress the consciences of religious-minded parents. He is probably only a young politician anxious to capture the Cliffordite votes, that with their aid he may distinguish himself by carrying through a measure which will leave its mark on the history of the country. But when he goes about the country speaking of "our friends" the Passive Resisters, declaring that denominational education is a thing he "hates," and promising us next year an Education Bill which we shall find to be not peace but "a sword," and meanwhile sending out a Code which, though only an administrative act, threatens us with new disabilities of the gravest kind, we are forced to credit him with an intention to ride rough-shod over our consciences by subjecting our children to a wholesale system of State proselytism.

The foregoing paragraphs form a somewhat long introduction, if such it is to be called, but it has seemed desirable to emphasize as much as possible Mr. Birrell's recent recognition of the soundness of a principle which, if accepted, completely justifies the claims of the Catholics, and condemns the projects of the present Board of Education. But we must now turn to the new Regulations which the Board has just issued: to consider their contents, and their bearing on the welfare of our schools. There are three sets of Regulations issued, one regarding the Training Colleges, another the Secondary Schools, and a third the Elementary Schools. It is the first two of these which are the most threatening.

Training Colleges and Hostels. In the Regulations concerning the constitution and administration of these, we find the following provisions.

Sect. 7. (g) After the 1st of August, no institution not already recognized as a Training College or Hostel will be so recognized, unless it is either provided by a Local Education Authority, or is conducted by a Body of Governors acting under and in accordance with a Scheme, or other written instrument or body of regulations, approved by the Board. The instrument under which a Training College or Hostel is governed :

- (i.) Must not require any members of the teaching staff to belong or not to belong to any particular religious denomination.
- (ii.) Must not require a majority of the Governing Body (whether in virtue of their tenure of any other office, or otherwise) to belong or not to belong to any particular religious denomination.
- (iii.) Must not provide for the appointment of a majority of the Governing Body by any person or persons who, or by any body the majority of whom, are required (whether in virtue of their tenure of any other office or otherwise) to belong or not to belong to any particular religious denomination.

(h) After the 1st of August, 1907, no institution not already recognized as a Training College or Hostel will be so recognized unless the following conditions are observed :

- (i.) No catechism or formulary distinctive of any particular religious denomination may be taught in the College or Hostel, except in cases where the parent or guardian of any student requests the Governors in writing to provide for the student religious instruction in the doctrines, catechism, or formularies distinctive of any particular denomination. In such cases, the Governors may, if they think fit, and if the instrument under which the College or Hostel is governed requires or does not prohibit the giving of such instruction in the College or Hostel, comply with such request and provide such instruction accordingly out of funds other than Grants made by the Board of Education or any Local Authority.
- (ii.) In Colleges or Hostels where such instruction is given the Governors must make regulations as soon as practicable to secure observance of the provisions of this Section. A copy of such regulations must be given to the parent or guardian of each student.
- (iii.) Records must be kept of all requests made to the Governors in respect of religious instruction under (i) of this Section.

And for the admission of students the following.

Sect. 8. In general the selection of particular persons for admission to a Training College or Hostel rests with the authorities of each College or Hostel, acting through such agents as they may appoint. Such persons must possess the qualifications required by the Board. The admission of Students to a Training College in 1907 must be conducted in accordance with Section 8 of the Regulations for the Training of Teachers, 1906. In the case of candidates admitted, or applying to be admitted, to a Training College or Hostel in 1908, the following conditions must in all cases be observed :

- (a) The Principal or Official Correspondent of every Training College or Hostel in receipt of Grant must keep for the use of the Board of Education a Register of candidates for admission in the order in which their applications are received and opened. This register must show particularly all information as to the qualifications of the candidates which has been received (1) prior to, (2) together with, (3) subsequent to, the applications.
- (b) If the candidate has been refused admission, the Register must state also, in as much detail as possible, the reasons for refusal. The actual reasons must be recorded for the information of the Board confidentially, if needs be ; but they need not be communicated to the candidate or his friends in the form in which they are recorded.
- (c) Applications received before the 1st of August of the year before that in which admission is desired must be returned with the intimation that they cannot be received or recorded until that date.
- (d) In no circumstances may the application of a candidate be rejected on the ground of religious faith or by reason of his refusal to undertake to attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship, or any religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects in the College or elsewhere ; nor on the ground of social antecedents or the like.
- (e) Applications may be made by or on behalf of any candidate who has been refused admission to a College with a view to obtaining the Board's decision as to whether Section 8 has been infringed.
- (f) If the grounds on which a candidate has been rejected are in the view of the Board unreasonable, the College or Hostel concerned will be liable to a reduction in its total Grant for the year not exceeding £100 on the first occasion, and to removal from the list of recognized Colleges or Hostels on the second occasion.

- (g) No College or Hostel may impose on candidates for admission an examination, written or oral, in addition to such examinations as may be approved by the Board as qualification for admission.
- (h) No recognized student may be required to withdraw from a College or Hostel on any ground similar to those set forth in Section 8 (d).

It will be observed that these new Regulations for the constitution and administration of Training Colleges and Hostels refer to those, not already recognized as such, which may apply to be recognized after August 1st of this year. It is clear then that as long as these Regulations hold, we Catholics can never hope to add a new Training College to our present list. Sect. 7 (g) i. ii. iii. would not only effectually exclude persons like the Vincentian Fathers at Hammersmith, or the nuns of Mount Pleasant or North Kensington, from having any part either in the control, or the administration, or the teaching, of a Training College or Hostel; it would also exclude any Governing Board or Teaching Staff which could inspire confidence in Catholic parents. Indeed, it is strange that the Board of Education should have judged it necessary to arrange for the case of Training Colleges or Hostels not provided by a Local Education Authority. Only those anxious to secure the religious faith of their children would think of going to the expense of building and founding a Voluntary Training College or Hostel, and none of these "deeply religious" persons would be so foolish as to expend their money on an institution which was at once to be taken out of their hands and applied to purposes the exact contrary of those they had at heart. Fortunately, as regards the women teachers, the Catholic body in England already possesses a supply of Training College accommodation for our present use: for we have Mount Pleasant, North Kensington, Southampton, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Salford, and Hull, and these can supply places for a good proportion of the students required to staff our schools—though not for all the Catholic aspirants to the teaching profession. For men teachers we have only one College, that of Hammersmith, but this is unfortunately sufficient for the present, as the teaching profession does not offer much attraction to Catholic young men, and, as long as the children leave school at so early an age, women teachers can in most cases manage them.

Still, things may alter in the future, and the Catholic body will certainly expand. It is an outrage, therefore, that the means of providing for its future necessities should be cut off.

Another point. Although our existing Training Colleges are not touched by the provisions of Section 7, it will be noticed that they are touched just as much as the others by those of Section 8. The fundamental article here is that of Subsection (*d*), according to which the religion of the applicant is not to be considered in deciding whether to admit him, or her, into a Training College where there are vacancies. The precedent on which the Board relies for this is doubtless the long-established custom of the Elementary Schools, where children may not be excluded, say, from Catholic schools, because they are not Catholics, and yet are not found in them in such numbers as to destroy their Catholic character. But in the first place, the intermixture of children of different faiths is much more disconcerting, not to say demoralizing, in a Boarding School than in a Day School, and in the second place the further provisions of Section 8 point to an intention to utilize this Section for the utter destruction of the denominational character of the Training College. All names of applicants are to be entered "in the order in which their applications are received and opened," in a Register, for the use of the Board of Education, and with the names all information received as to qualifications, together with, in the case of refusal, the reasons of refusal "with as much detail as possible." It is easy to see how this is meant to act, and how if insisted on it must have the effect of destroying the Catholic character of any Catholic Training College a group of Passive Resisters may take it into their heads to capture. Let them cause a large batch of their candidates to send in applications to arrive at the Training College by the first post on August 1st of 1908, or of any subsequent year, and they cannot well fail to attain their desire. Unless acquainted beforehand with the handwritings on the envelopes the authorities of the College could not well distinguish which letters it would suit them best to open first, and besides it would be taken as suspicious if they entered all the Catholics as the first applicants. Accordingly, they would have no control whatever over the religious character of those whom they mechanically accepted, and the probability is that there would be an equal group of each, perhaps a larger group of Protestants. And so the funds gathered in with much

self-sacrifice for the maintenance of Catholic education, and sunk in the building, would be diverted to alien uses. Of course, it is possible that the Board of Education is not intending to be rigid in exercising its rights, and it may be that no great number of Protestants would wish to place themselves under Catholic teachers. But at all events a very effective power to injure us in this way is taken, and the Catholic Training Colleges must feel that henceforth their freedom to do their own work satisfactorily is held on the most precarious tenure.

Secondary Schools. The Regulations for Secondary Schools are of a complicated character, and we must confine ourselves in the present article to that aspect of them which concerns the previous education of those destined ultimately for the Training Colleges. Young people who wish to become teachers in the Elementary Schools are encouraged, and now more or less constrained, to place themselves for two or three years under the discipline of a Secondary School, called in that case a Teachers' Centre. From a religious as well as a secular point of view it is a most critical period of the young people's lives, and one to which are specially applicable the considerations which Mr. Birrell has so forcibly set forth as causing a just anxiety to parents who think the character of religious faith is of the utmost importance. Accordingly, the Catholics of this country have during the last few years been making great efforts to arrange for the reception of this class of pupils into certain of their Secondary Schools. It has not been an easy task, in view of the conditions exacted by the Imperial or Local Authorities, and of the difficulty of placing schools within reach of pupils spread over such extensive areas. Hence, though some forty suitable Centres have been provided, and have vindicated their right to exist by the good work they are doing, the supply is up to the present very far from sufficient. Of course this class of pupils in their poverty are not able to bear the expenses of their tuition, still less of their maintenance in residential schools. But the Board, seeing this practical difficulty, has of late years been accustomed to pay grants to Colleges approved by it as efficient, in respect of the candidates qualified to obtain this contribution towards their keep. It was a wise arrangement (though imperfect through the inadequacy of the scale fixed for the grants); and the Catholic schools on

the Board's list have been receiving these grants and training their pupils with a success which, speaking of them generally, has satisfied the Board's Inspectors and those of the local authorities, as well as the children themselves and their parents. But now Mr. McKenna proposes to wreck all this promising system. After August 1st of this year, it will not be possible to get accepted for the purpose of receiving grants from public funds, any School-Centre which does not consent effectually to divest itself of its denominational character and allow the funds sunk in building and furnishing it to be diverted for the benefit of pupils of other faiths. This is secured by a Section 12, which is *verbatim* the same as the already quoted Section 7 (*g.*) of the Regulations for Training Colleges. The effect of this Section is, then, to drive all Catholic aspirants to the Teachers' office, who for one reason or another cannot find admission into the Catholic School-Centres already recognized, into schools of which the Protestant or Indifferentist atmosphere cannot fail to be injurious to their faith. To the Centres already recognized some small temporary mercies are vouchsafed by Sections 17, 18, 19. Where any such Centres are fortunate enough to induce the Local Education Authority to "pass a resolution informing the Board that the school in question is in their view required as part of the Secondary School provision for their area," they may by Section 17 be allowed, without forfeiting their denominational character, to continue to receive grants on the same scale as schools provided by the Local Authority itself. This, no doubt, will be a help in places where the Local Educational Authorities are fair-minded, but will place us more than ever at the mercy of persecuting Authorities like those in the West Riding. There is, indeed, a further concession in Section 19, by which schools recognized by the Board previously to August 1, 1907, may, even if the Local Authority refuses to recommend them as required for its school provision, receive grants on a lower scale than is accorded to undenominational schools. It will be pleaded, of course, in defence of the Regulations that the grant allowed to the schools of this class is what they have been receiving hitherto, and that they are only mulcted of the additional grant which it is proposed to give to the undenominational schools in the future. But with the bestowal of the additional grant additional requirements are sure to be coupled, and these our Centres will be expected to fulfil, though bidden to be content with the

lesser grant; and anyhow the fact remains that an unwarrantable distinction is made. We must add that, amidst all the complexities of the two sets of Regulations, those for Secondary Schools, and those for the Preliminary Education of Elementary School Teachers, we find it hard to understand whether the distinction between already recognized schools for which the Local Education Authorities have or have not pleaded, is to have any bearing on the question of their power to receive Pupil Teachers (to give them their old name), and of the scale on which grants can be accorded to them. One thing, however, is certain; the vexatious condition that no grants can be given unless the pupils are admitted without regard to their Creed, applies to this earlier stage of their training, just as much as to the subsequent stage in the Training Colleges themselves.

Such is the system with which we are threatened, and it will be felt that we have not exaggerated the injury it forebodes to our children's faith. But can we do anything to ward it off? Of course it may be that we are destined to endure the full measure of the wrong. For whether we look across the Channel to the persecution under which our French brethren are suffering now, or back to the Tudors and the Stuarts and the persecutions our forefathers had to endure then, it is seen that a persecution like that which threatens can be permitted by God's Providence to work to the bitter end and extensively attain its objects. But we must strive to save our children, and at least this much we can do. John Bull thinks slowly and often perversely. But he insists on putting down injustice, when once he has been made aware of its existence. And we have a very strong case, if we will only persist in pressing it upon public attention. The following two points we ought at all events to keep constantly before our own people and before the public.

(1.) There can be no doubt about the reality of our grievance. If the denominational, which in our case is the Catholic, character of our schools and Colleges is taken away, there will be nothing to differentiate them from the undenominational institutions set up by the County Councils. And that will mean that we derive absolutely no advantage from the large sums sunk in constructing, maintaining, and furnishing the school-buildings. To go to the concrete. We Catholics have six Training Colleges for women teachers, and one for men teachers. Of these the latter,

having been erected before 1870, received at the time a building grant of £4,000. That, however, is not a tenth part of the general costs of the site and of the building which were defrayed by the Catholics themselves. Of the six Colleges for women not one has received a single penny of building grant, and the expenses of building and of site have been very heavy. Mr. Macnamara gave the figures a short time ago, but we have not them by us. Mount Pleasant, however, as we believe, cost over £69,000, the equivalent of some £2,000 a year. Yet under the threatened system the Nonconformists, who (if we except the Wesleyans who have two Colleges in London) have never contributed a penny towards the building of Training Colleges, are to have exactly the same advantage out of that £2,000 a year as the Catholics by whom, and for whose sake it was contributed. The unfairness of such an arrangement must strike every just-minded person who is made aware of its existence. The Passive Resisters ask, indeed, where are they to send their children to be trained, the undenominational Training Colleges not having room for them all? But the answer is simple, for they can do one or other of two things. They can do as we have done and build Training Colleges to meet their wants, which if they would do, the entire situation would be relieved, for they might be assured we should not think it honest to push our children into establishments built with their money for their use. Or they may insist on more undenominational Colleges being built, in which case they would have the advantage of getting for nothing what we have to pay heavily for; as undenominational Colleges according to their contention furnish just that kind of teaching, atmosphere, &c., which they think good for their children. Nor are we otherwise than most willing and desirous that Nonconformists, as well as pure Secularists, should have Colleges and schools of their own sort for the use of their own children; and have them, if they will, financed entirely by the rates and taxes. But surely whilst our Colleges are so full that well-qualified Catholic candidates have to be refused, it is indefensible to require that Nonconformists who have contributed nothing towards the building of our Colleges and schools should be preferred to us who have contributed so much to it, and should be allowed to turn out our candidates in order to make room for their own. If, indeed, we had places to spare for others, and they would consent to come in as Protestant children are often sent by their parents to our convent schools,

though still thinking the arrangement undesirable, we might find it easier to tolerate. We should do our best for them, and make no attempts to force our religion upon their unwilling consciences, our own consciences in fact imposing on us this mode of treating those of other faiths confided to our care. But what we are threatened with in the present instance is something very different to this, for the Protestant candidates are to be forced on us; forced on us in such a way that we must receive them without reference to their characters or their friendly feelings towards our institutions, and forced on us in such wise that when they are admitted they are to play cuckoo in our nests, pushing the religious teaching and observances of our own candidates into holes and corners, and requiring that their religion or irreligion should alone be permitted to walk abroad.

(2) Secondly, we must keep insisting on the reality of our complaint that this undenominational system, in enforcing which upon our children the new Regulations are but a freshly framed and more powerful instrument, is, in fact, a veritable system of State proselytism. It is for this that in the title of this article we have called Mr. McKenna's new clauses "the anti-Conscience Clauses." Such a phrase is no misnomer for them, for the idea of a Conscience Clause is to protect the conscience of a pupil from teaching hostile and injurious to his faith, whereas the effect of Mr. McKenna's new clauses, in their application to Boarding Colleges, is precisely to constrain the pupil to expose himself to teaching hostile and injurious to his faith. The usual reply to this contention is by maintaining that it is only the formal teaching of a religious lesson which exercises any influence on the religious belief and observance of the pupil. But that is absolutely false, and regarded as false by all classes of "deeply religious" persons, Nonconformists as well as Catholics, where their own children are concerned—as we need not demonstrate any more now since Mr. Birrell has demonstrated it for us in the passages we have quoted from his Irish speech. Only we would once more exhort our fellow-Catholics to recognize the importance of Mr. Birrell's admissions. We must not allow them to be forgotten as long as the present controversy lasts, for they go to the root of the whole case, and make it impossible for the present Government, as long as Mr. Birrell retains his seat in its Cabinet, to disregard our entreaties for separate treatment without exposing itself, or at least him, to a grave charge of inconsistency.

(3) We should point out too how unpractical and dangerous is the provision in the new Code by which it is sought to prevent a candidate from being rejected, or after admission dismissed, from the Training College on the score of religion. This provision, it is true, is in itself not new, but we refer to it because of the far greater significance it will have now that the choice of candidates is taken from us. The reasons for rejection, which we presume are intended to include also the reasons for dismissal, are to be reported to the Board of Education "with as much detail as possible." Suppose the reasons to be, as necessarily they would always be in the case of dismissal, acts of misconduct on the part of the pupil, how is it possible that an authority so impersonal as a Board of Education could decide rationally on such a delicate subject, and how could it be right for a College authority to divulge a matter so confidential to a distant authority. Such cases of misconduct will occur at times when for the preservation of the other pupils it is desirable to remove an erring companion. But a Catholic Headmaster or Headmistress will always feel that it would be cruel to affix a lasting stigma on an offender whose whole life is before him, and that the circumstances and manner of his removal should be shrouded in all possible secrecy. And the probable result of this clause in the Regulations must be that the Superior of a College would prefer to tolerate almost every offence in the pupil, no matter what the consequences to the others, rather than become responsible for divulging to an outside authority, and that an impersonal Board, a delinquency discreditable to one of the pupils.

In conclusion we should like to raise a question suggested by the example set us by the Catholic Miners in the Low Valley. Do we not need a Catholic Parents' Association for the protection of their rights in this matter of State Education? It seems to us important for two reasons: (1) In proportion as the Education Office enters more and more into an alliance with squalid conditions of living, drink, and such-like causes which counteract the endeavours of our clergy, when the latter exhort and encourage their flocks to follow the higher impulses of their nature, we must expect to see an increasing number of those poor people yielding helplessly to the anti-Catholic conditions enforced upon them. But in these circumstances it is most desirable that we should know which of our people we

can rely upon to stand fast by their faith in fighting this battle on its behalf: and a Parents' Association might be of much use in thus rallying our forces. (2) Though the controversies of the last eighteen months have made our Catholic parents understand much better than they did before how serious is the crisis that has arisen, they are still too ready to rely upon their priests to represent them; and only imperfectly realize that they must bear the brunt of the battle themselves, and should make themselves widely and thoroughly acquainted with the details of the subject, and the manner in which the schools of their own particular neighbourhood will be affected. A Parents' Association might become an instrument for diffusing this fuller information, especially if it were supported by an abundant supply of tracts and leaflets written in a very plain and direct style, such as our working people love.

S. F. S.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

"Roman Catholic" Correspondents.

SOME of our contemporaries, both magazines and newspapers, are rather fond of ticketing anonymous correspondents as "Roman Catholic," which might lead the inexperienced reader to anticipate in their contributions information as to the views and sentiments of the Catholic body in this country. As a matter of fact, however, we have long since learnt that these are writers whom no one would ever suppose to be Catholics were they not formally described as such, just as the Chinese used to put the label "Soldier" on their warriors, lest they should not be recognized as such.

These "Roman Catholic" correspondents are, indeed, as a rule, more bitterly anti-Roman than any others, and seem to delight in a display of contumacy and insubordination quite incompatible with the most fundamental principles of Catholicism. How these gentlemen explain their own position and their claim to be what in any true sense they manifestly are not, we do not pretend to inquire, for the vagaries and perversities of the mind of man are infinite and inscrutable. But what purpose do reputable journals think to serve by publishing the effusions of religious freaks, who have even less right to speak in the name of their Catholic fellow-countrymen than the tailors of Tooley Street in that of the people of England?

Here, for example, is how a "Roman Catholic Correspondent," who frequently favours the *Church Times* with his views, commences an article in its issue of July 19th :

It may be said, without paradox, that the crisis in the French Church might have been better understood in other countries if public attention had been less exclusively given to French affairs. For the Papal policy in France is only the local application of a general policy, and in order that it may be understood, its application in other countries must be studied. It will then be found that that policy is

everywhere characterized by the same intolerance and fanaticism, the same belittling of episcopal authority, the same disregard of the opinion of local Catholics, the same unreasoning adherence to all that is old merely because it is old, and opposition to all that is new merely because it is new. The whole of contemporary thought, philosophy, and science—the critical and historical methods which are accepted and used by all scholars and students of every religious belief and every shade of opinion—are summed up in one of those comprehensive and ridiculous terms beloved at the Vatican, and condemned root and branch as “Modernism.” And everywhere this policy is having the same results; it is producing a crisis of faith, it is repelling the intelligent in every class, it is serving the purpose of the enemies of the Church and of religion.

There is much more to the same effect, but enough has probably been cited to show that the writer belongs to that Modern School for whom whatever can be styled “Vaticanism” is an abomination, and is condemned off-hand, as he declares “Modernism” to be at the Vatican. It may also be judged what claim he has to be presented to our reading public as a “Roman Catholic Correspondent.”

Cercles d'Études.

It was suggested in THE MONTH¹ of July, that organized study was a feature of those Christian Syndicates which strive to cope with the social situation in Belgium. In France, too, the need of a social education for the working classes has evolved the *Cercles d'Études* described by the Abbé Leleu in a pamphlet edited by the *Action Populaire*.²

The idea of Christian Clubs for the study of social questions can be traced to a happy resolution passed by the *Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers*, in 1892. It was soon taken up by the social bodies of Belgium and the north of France, and, thanks largely to the zeal of the well-known Abbé Garnier, it occupies to-day the chief place in the constitution of the leading Catholic workmen's unions on the Continent, such as the *Patronages Unions*, the *Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française*, and the *Sillon*. Many Congresses of these clubs have been held,

¹ “A Penny Catechism,” THE MONTH, July, 1907.

² *Les Cercles d'Études*. Leleu. Paris: Lecoffre. 2'50 c.

and at the last one, which met in Lyons two years ago, more than fifteen hundred clubs were represented.

In 1894, the *Congrès ouvrier chrétien* thus formulated its intention: "Considering that workmen should learn to discuss their own interests, that study in common is necessary to teach them to judge of ideas and institutions, this Congress resolves that at all industrial and agricultural centres, in town or country, there be formed clubs for social studies." It is plain, therefore, that the clubs do not aim at any regular course of higher mental culture; they are no mere multiplication of "Ruskin Hall;" nor do they pretend to supplant the night classes and lectures of Polytechnic Schools. They rather aim at supplementing the deficiencies of existing institutions purely on the social and religious sides, which are becoming almost conterminous.

Two necessary elements constitute a study club, (1) the members, (2) the chairman. Of the former, *work* is exacted; personal private reading and assiduity at public meetings; drones are death to the hive. To facilitate this, the members should not be numerous: never more than twelve compose one club. Nor should they be accepted at haphazard, but should be picked with great discretion, especially in the beginning.

The office of the chairman is to advise books, suggest references, point out general principles when his club consists of grown men, and to direct the club more closely in the case of youths. On the other hand, since liberty and initiative are essential to an institution the very life of which is the spontaneous zeal of its members, the club is to be, in every sense of the word, the *property* of those members. For this reason the chairman should direct, not command. He does not, in ordinary circumstances, give lectures or classes to his club; his office is to help individuals in the choice of a subject for special study, to correct errors, close debates, &c. Himself an educated man, he may be assisted by a president and a secretary, elected annually from the members. Both these offices will greatly help towards moral formation, the former by the leading of discussion, and the latter by catching and expressing in writing the thoughts of the speakers.

Fixed rules for the management or method to be adhered to in these clubs are dangerous if minute. Each club shapes itself according to the age and standard of education of its members. In addition, however, to general facilities for private reading, there must be periodical reunions, at the beginning of which,

after a short prayer, the order of the day is read ; elections and resolutions are announced. The parish priest who (need we say ?) will be a member of the club, though probably not an official, may speak for a few moments in a simple style on a point at once practical and religious, and be glad of questions and discussion. Then follows the main feature of the meeting, either a lecture, or a debate, or a synopsis of a newspaper extract, or even a catechism with question and answer if the members are very young.¹ All if possible should take part, and the chairman should interpose as little as possible.

What is needed then is the *room*, the *books*, and the *men* educated and devoted enough to spend their evenings in helping study and directing the meetings. Though our working classes in England may fall short of the Continental in fertility of ideas, still their ability to read and their keenness to think advance by giant strides. What if they think wrong? Think wrong they will, if their thinking is started for them by the a-Catholic, often anti-Catholic, newspapers and lectures to which they devote whole hours, and from which they get clever catchwords and potent generalizations. We have failed so far to supply *ideas*: the walls of our "closed gardens" of piety are crumbling.

One anecdote, the more striking since it comes from "ideaful" France.

The head of a Catholic workmen's club asked five or six of his most satisfactory members a few of the questions which are the Socialist's commonplaces. Not one could suggest an answer. "Don't your mates ever talk of that sort of thing?" "All day, and every day." "What do you answer?" "Nothing." "And they think you are blockheads?" "They say Catholics are all of them dummies; all turned out on one pattern!" A Catholic answer to one of the questions was suggested. The men found their tongues at once: objections poured out. Their interlocutor showed his astonishment at their undesirable "new learning." "Beg pardon, sir," said one of them apologetically, "but it's that all day long in the workshop, and here no one ever mentions it."

V. B.

¹ Parliamentary speeches of actual moment, and important "leaders" are discussed. Theoretical points, like the just wage, or property; and practical questions demanding technical knowledge—such as children's labour, vine-growing, workmen's housing—are specimens of the questions dealt with.

Reviews.

I.—THE DECISIONS OF THE HOLY SEE.¹

WHEN some Bull, or Encyclical Letter, or Decree of a Sacred Congregation is published, and it is found to include a doctrinal pronouncement, men are sure to ask what degree of authority is attached to it, and what kind of assent it demands. Nor, though it is disedifying to refuse the requisite assent even to Decrees of the lowest class, is it unreasonable to be interested in these questions, and to ask for a book which will explain them and reply to them. Such a book, likely to be as helpful to educated laymen as to the clergy, is the Abbé Choupin's *Valeur des Décisions du Saint Siège*. After a brief first part, in which he discusses the nature and object of Infallibility, he proceeds in his second part to consider the kind of assent due to Infallible decisions, to Encyclical Letters and Constitutions in which infallibility is not implicated, to the Doctrinal Decrees of the Holy Office (the only Sacred Congregation capable of pronouncing doctrinal decisions), and to the disciplinary Decrees of the Inquisition itself or of other Congregations. In a third part he relates the history of the Syllabus of 1864, and discusses its dogmatic value, concluding that

if it cannot be said with certainty that the Syllabus is a definition *ex cathedra*, or that it is guaranteed in all its parts by the Infallibility of the Church, it is at all events an act of the Sovereign Pontiff, a doctrinal decision of the Pope, having authority throughout the whole Church, to which, therefore, all the faithful owe respect and obedience.

In a fourth part the author applies his principles to the Galileo case. Galileo came before two Sacred Congregations, the Holy Office and the Index, and on two occasions—in 1616 and 1633. In 1616, the two propositions condemning the

¹ *La valeur des Décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint Siège*. Par Lucien Choupin, Professeur du Droit Canonique au Scholasticat d'Ore, Hastings. Paris : Beauchesne et Cie.

Copernican system were brought before the Holy Office, and were pronounced by its consultors, and after by the Cardinals, to be—one heretical, the other erroneous in faith; but this draft Decree condemning them was never published, the Pope contenting himself with exacting from Galileo a retractation, which was given, and ordering the publication of a Decree of the Index (which being such was only disciplinary) forbidding the reading of books favourable to Copernicanism. In 1633, the Holy Office published a Decree in which it declared Galileo vehemently suspect of heresy for continuing to hold the Copernican doctrine, but the author argues, it seems to us with success, that this Decree, though emanating from a Congregation able to pass a doctrinal Decree, was, in fact, only disciplinary. It is a judicial Decree, prohibiting Galileo's latest book, and imposing on him certain penalties (which were remitted the next day), and it has no doctrinal statements save in the *considerants* that give the motives for the prohibition and condemnation—which is not enough to make the Decree doctrinal. Moreover, neither this Decree nor that of 1616 had any Papal approbation *in forma speciali*; whereas only when such an approbation is given does the Decree of a Congregation become Papal. The fifth part of this little volume, which takes up nearly two-thirds of its pages, is a detailed commentary of the articles of the Syllabus of 1864. This should certainly be read by any one who wishes to form a trustworthy opinion as to the meaning of its condemnations, for it is impossible to judge of them correctly as long as the context from which they are taken is not known.

2.—SOME LITURGICAL HANDBOOKS, *Collection Science et Religion*.¹

This wonderful series of cheap and useful handbooks, published by Bloud et Cie., is, we are glad to say, by slow degrees becoming much better known in England. That it has met with remarkable success in the country of its origin may be fairly inferred from the fact that the series is continually being added to, and that the later volumes show, on the whole, a constant improvement in quality. The writers are of higher standing, the books more scholarly and less superficial, the

¹ *Collection Science et Religion. Liturgie, série publiée sous la direction du Révérendissime Dom Cabrol, Abbé de Farnborough. Paris: Bloud et Cie. 1907.*

paper and typography are better, and the average bulk of the volumes has been increased. It was an excellent idea to add a liturgical section to the ground already covered, and no more competent editor could have been found for the purpose than Abbot Cabrol. Of course, some few liturgical volumes, or volumes with a liturgical bearing, have already appeared in the series at a much earlier date, but what seems now contemplated is a succession of little manuals of a really scientific character which might be used for text-books in any school or seminary. The volume on the Breviary, by Dom Jules Baudot, O.S.B.—a double number which consequently costs 1 f. 20 c.—is an excellent example of what is now being attempted. In substance, it may be said to provide a synopsis of the great work of Dom Bäumer on the Roman Breviary, but the summary is one very judiciously made, brought up to date in many details, clearly written, and well printed. Considering the nature of the subject and the not inconsiderable typographical difficulties which this particular volume presents, these 184 pages for just a shilling are a marvel of cheapness. One valuable feature which we do not remember to have seen elsewhere is an Appendix, which supplies in a tabular form an indication of the date at which all the festivals in the calendar were introduced, together with their present grade as doubles, semi-doubles, &c., and an indication of the changes, if any, which have befallen them. Another recent addition is the volume of A. Gastoué on *Holy Water*. A very frank account is given to begin with of the use of lustral water in various pagan rites, and this is followed by a careful summary of the available evidence regarding the use of blessed water among Christians. The fact that the Prayer-book of Serapion has been fully turned to account, as well as Dom Férotin's edition of the Spanish Ordinals, shows that a careful regard has been had to the most recent developments. Other volumes of the same series which we can do no more than mention, are the excellent tractate on *Lent*, by the well-known liturgist V. Ermoni; that on *Christmas*, by A. Gastoué; and that on the *Assumption*, by P. Renaudin. The only criticism which suggests itself to us is that it is a pity that the other publications of the collection are not more fully advertised in the volumes themselves, either by means of loose sheets or by utilizing the blank pages.

3.—THE CHURCH IN ENGLISH HISTORY.¹

Though we have now many handbooks on English History from a Catholic point of view, and several good ones, Miss Stone's volume seems to fill a want to which others did not address themselves. Hers is an account of the Church supplementary to the text-book for political history; and while covering the whole period, it also tries "to create interest" by describing the striking incidents in detail. The result is a compact but readable volume, which does not go deeply into controversy or criticism, but will nevertheless answer such ordinary questions as teachers are wont to put to their scholars, or to have put to themselves.

The story is told with an evident desire to be fair to all parties, and the religious tone is clear, though not aggressive. Accuracy has also been carefully attended to, and we have noticed but few unimportant slips, *e.g.*, Archbishop Adam of Sudbury was murdered on Tower Hill, not in St. John's Chapel (p. 136), nor was a third of the country Catholic at the end of Elizabeth's reign (p. 226). A superlative is here and there used too freely, Elizabeth did not "seize *every* opportunity to conspire" against Queen Mary (p. 204). Most teachers, again, would advise a much freer use of criticism when dealing with a subject like the "Lucius legend" (p. 3). But these are small things. Miss Stone's bright and scholarly pages are sure to be welcomed both by teachers and students.

4.—VERS LA HAINE.²

In England those who would drive all our poor children into so-called undenominational schools assure us that in such schools the children need never fear lest the teacher's influence should be used to alienate them from the religion of their parents. The same assurance is given by the French Radicals when they shut up the private schools, and "laicize," that is, secularize, the schools of the State. These State schools, they say, are conducted on the principles of the strictest neutrality.

¹ *The Church in English History*. By J. M. Stone. 287 pp. London: Sands and Co. 1907.

² *Vers la Haine*. Par Pierre Gourdon. Paris: Lethielleux.

Unfortunately, the results do not accord with their promises and assurances, but the problem is how to bring this fact home to the politically influential class which is so prone to be taken in by fair words and phrases. M. Gourdon justly thinks that a novel—a problem novel, as we should call it over here—is most suitable for this purpose, and this is the character of his *Vers la Haine* which lies before us. It is a model of literary style, and is marked by a solicitude, dictated alike by polemical and by artistic insight, to keep entirely within the bounds of probability, and to credit his unwholesome as well as his wholesome characters with the best intentions.

Mathurin Fruchant and François Chauvigné are brothers-in-law, having married two sisters. Fruchant is a yeoman farmer, Chauvigné a road-mender, and as such a *fonctionnaire*. Fruchant has a wife and family, all good simple Angevin Catholics. Chauvigné, whose wife had also been remarkable for her piety, is now a widower, and a good fellow on the whole with a tender veneration as well as affection for his lost wife, and anxious to bring up his only child as she would have wished. In the village of Maimboeuf-en-Manges there is a school kept by some Religious which practically all the children of the village attend, and a State school with a young schoolmaster, an anti-clerical but educationally thoroughly competent, and ambitious of making for himself a career and advance in his profession. This schoolmaster, M. Montjoy, meets Chauvigné at his work one day. After a few words of flattery he comes to the point.

"M. Chauvigné, you have a child of remarkable intelligence."

"Oh," said the road-maker, flattered, but perceiving the trap, "the little one learns well."

"My predecessor had not the advantage of counting him among his pupils. I do not blame you for that. . . . But it seems to me that I myself am not unworthy of your confidence. I have some degrees of service to my credit, and if I am sent here to this modest post, it is only that the people of these parts may see that the official school is quite as good as the other."

"The school year began three months ago," timidly argued the road-maker. "Changes are bad."

"In principle, yes. But do you not think that your son would gain by finding himself with a smaller number of companions, so as to receive more attention from the master? Do not, M. Chauvigné, be influenced by prejudices. They say that our schools are schools without God. How untrue! We merely try in them to pay respect, in our treatment of the creeds, to liberty of conscience. Could there

be a finer object to set before ourselves, one more worthy of human reason? I do not know what your private views are or your philosophical opinions, M. Chauvigné, but you are a *fonctionnaire*, and so attached to the institutions of your country. What more natural than to place your child under the protection of official neutrality? You may be sure your liberty will be respected, and at the same time you will draw down upon yourself the esteem and favour of your chiefs, who—give me leave to say it—might very soon come to be astonished at an attitude like yours. Well, good-bye, M. Chauvigné. Think about it, think about it!"

Chauvigné understands very well what it means, but is reluctant to take his child away from the Brothers, especially as the child himself is disconsolate at the prospect. But M. Montjoy receives a visit from the road-inspector, and has a conversation with him which he takes care Chauvigné shall overhear.

"This must cease" [he says to the road-inspector, raising his voice]. "Get then from your chiefs instructions which will enable you to be down on him. It cannot be permitted in high places that a *fonctionnaire* should go on sending his child to the Congregation School."

Chauvigné hesitates no longer. Either the boy must be transferred to the State school or the father must lose his only means of livelihood. The transference is accordingly made, to the scandal of the whole village, and, at first, to the horror of little Prosper. But the schoolmaster is shrewd. He gains his pupil's affections, he teaches him so well that he makes rapid progress, and he flatters him till his simplicity is destroyed. Meanwhile, Montjoy insists that he shall know his Catechism and its meaning better than any other child in the village, and by this means renders it impossible to reject him from First Communion, though of piety he has very little.

During the years that followed, the master was most careful to abstain from anything like a direct attack on his pupil's faith,

[But] a thousand imperceptible remarks, too undefined to be offensive, too skilful not to have some effect, had insensibly destroyed that filial respect for holy things which causes a child to turn away with horror when it hears them contemned for the first time. Very harmless and insignificant trifles at the beginning, a little ridicule of the Curé, the refutation of a phrase in his sermon, a little discreet chaff about the good Sisters and their *paternosters*, or about the air of compunction on Brother Saturnin's countenance. . . . Later on, all the fictions which

anti-clericalism pompously decorates with the title of "Lessons from History," . . . the crusade against the Albigensians, the Inquisition, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, &c., making up, according to M. Montjoy, a fearful whole which the White Terror crowned with its approval.

As the boy's school-days drew to an end he was told more directly that the narrow horizons of village life differed much from those of the towns, and that elsewhere "human thought had solutions of the world's problems that were not those which religious dogmas asserted." The poison had been well instilled, but for a while Prosper was saved and reconciled to village life by the love of a pure-minded girl of strong faith. Still, only for a while. The time for his service in the army came, and then the schoolmaster knew how to use his opportunity. He introduced him to some anti-clerical friends, and soon poor Prosper's faith was extinct. The story is dexterously and pathetically worked out, and finishes with one of the scenes that France has had to witness so frequently of late years, the expulsion of some friars from their monastery. A hired crowd has been brought from Paris to throw stones at them, and François Chauvigné's indignation is stirred by the cowardice of one of these miscreants. Then he falls suddenly, seized by a heart failure. The miscreant was his own son Prosper.

5.—ANCIENT CATHOLIC HOMES OF SCOTLAND.¹

Dom Odo Blundell is to be thanked for this interesting record of persons and places both well worthy of being remembered. He does not claim to have done more than collect in popular form information which was already accessible to students, and this he has assuredly done, while the numerous and generally excellent illustrations (twenty-four half-tone blocks and seventeen line-blocks), of which his title-page says nothing, add a special value and interest to the book.

He has selected from among the ancestral homes of notable Scotch families, some whose names are specially connected with the ancient faith in the period since the Reformation, and down

¹ *Ancient Catholic Homes of Scotland.* By Dom Odo Blundell, O.S.B., Monk of Fort Augustus, with an Introduction by the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, of Abbotsford. Pp. xvi. and 199. London: Burns and Oates. 3s. 6d. net. 1907.

to our own day; several of their fabrics being still noble and picturesque in ruin, and some having other claims to distinction besides their religious associations. Thus Carlaverock Castle—now the property of Lord Herries—is supposed to be the original of Ellangowan in Scott's *Guy Mannerling*, and Traquair, belonging to his cousin, Maxwell-Stuart, of Tully Veolan, in *Waverley*. The latter house is also remarkable as being probably the oldest inhabited building in Scotland.

Besides these we have also Terregles (likewise belonging to the Maxwells), Letterfourie and Wardhouse in the Gordon country, Beaufort in that of the Frasers, Glenfinnan, closely connected with Prince Charlie, Kirkconnell and Fetternear, and incidentally we are introduced to spots of such interest as Sweetheart Abbey and Beaully Priory, and persons such as the heroic Lady Nithsdale and Bishop Hay.

But what above all gives Dom Blundell's history its value is the tale it has to tell in various forms of solid faith and sterling piety struggling to survive amid the most hostile surroundings, and the charm with which such a spirit can invest all whom it influences, and even the scenes wherein it was displayed. What Lady Nairne wrote of Kirkconnell, is true of other ancient homes as well, and in a sense deeper than the literal :

The wild rose and the jessamine
Still hang upon the wa',
How many cherished memories
Do they sweet flowers reca'?

6.—NAOMI'S TRANSGRESSION.¹

"Darley Dale" is known to Catholic readers as having made a special study of religious female Congregations. In the story before us she takes for her principal theme the spiritual life as it manifests itself outside the Church in such a body as the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers. The heroine, from whom the tale takes its name, is a remarkable young person, a leading light of the Society in Australia, in fact, one of its ministers, having a notable gift of the word.

¹ *Naomi's Transgression*. By Darley Dale. With Original Illustrations by Harold Piffard. London and New York: Frederick Warne and Co.

Her wealthy father, a man for whom no one seems to have a good word, has recently died and left her a substantial fortune, but saddled with a preposterous and iniquitous marriage condition. To nullify this and obtain the property, which she desires only for the sake of the good it will enable her to do, Naomi, who is firmly resolved to lead a single life, consents to the mad scheme of a non-Quaker friend, that the latter should go to England and by there personating her checkmate the testator's intention. The scheme fails, as it was bound to do, and realizing the wrongfulness of her conduct, Naomi resigns not only the ministry but the Society of Friends itself, and finally becomes a Catholic and takes the veil as a Sister of Charity. Her history involves that of several others, and no less than two happy marriages result from its various entanglements.

The tale is well told, and the characters are well drawn; but we cannot help wondering whether the picture of Quakerism is not, at least in parts, somewhat overdrawn. Is, for instance, "the rule of silence" one of its recognized observances, by which a man absolutely renounces the use of speech?

7.—A NEW FUGUE.¹

The fugues most often heard at pianoforte recitals are adaptations of Bach's great fugues for the organ. This is a pity, for the works in question are heard to far better effect on the instrument for which they were written. Why are the great "48" so rarely played? Why, indeed, are fugues so rarely played at all upon the pianoforte? Few women care for fugues: that is the answer. Lovers of this musical form should purchase Father Anthony C. H. Pollen's recently published *Prelude and Triple Fugue in A minor for the Pianoforte*. The subject of the fugue is original and ingeniously worked out, and, though exception may be taken to the length of the Episodes, the work is interesting throughout.

¹ *Prelude and Triple Fugue in A minor for the Pianoforte*. Composed by Father Anthony C. H. Pollen, of the Oratory. London: Novello and Co., Limited.

Short Notices.

The Seven Hills Magazine has entered on its second volume. It is published by Messrs. Duffy of Dublin, but edited at the Irish College, we believe, by the Oliver Plunket Society, Rome. The present number contains an instructive article on the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by Father Reginald Walsh, O.P.

It is distressing to find from the Catholic Education Council's *Report* for 1906 that the improvement in the collection for 1905 was not maintained in 1906. It had fallen from £937 4s. 3d. to £794 14s. 10d. That is a pity, as funds are so necessary just now, and a very little additional self-sacrifice, if such it can be called, on the part of each contributor would make an appreciable difference in the totals. It shows that this *Report* should be carefully read by all interested in maintaining our Catholic Elementary schools, for it is by the Catholic Education Council that our action in the present controversy is directed.

The *Report* of the St. Vincent of Paul's Society for 1906 yields a pleasing record of quiet and unobtrusive work for the poor in many places.

We must expect manuals of Frequent and Daily Communion to multiply, now that the Pope has so warmly recommended the practice. Father Arthur Devine's booklet bearing this title (*Washbourne*) contains all that a frequent communicant requires to know in regard to the needful dispositions, and the desirable devotions.

Harmony Flats (Benziger), or the Gifts of a Tenement-House Fairy, is a book for children, by C. S. Whitmore.

The Life of St. Humphrey the Hermit (Burns and Oates) is a translation from the *Vitae Patrum*, by Dean Kavanagh, and is dedicated to Sir Humphrey de Trafford. It is an artistic edition, with some excellent wood-cut illustrations.

For those who believe firmly in the teaching of Holy Scripture it is impossible not to realize that, in his essential dignity as compounded of spirit and matter, man is not the highest order of created beings. There are the angels, and what can we know or conjecture about their nature and life, and the functions they discharge in regard to their younger brethren of our race? *A Book of Angels* (Longmans) is a

reverent endeavour to reply to these questions. It is a series of papers on such subjects as the Angel of the Passover, a Survey of Scripture References to the Angelic Ministrations, the Seraphim, Ministering Angels, Angels of Victory. They are by Anglican clergymen of standing, most, perhaps all, of whom belong to the High Church party. Each writes independently, with the result that, as "L.P.," the editor, warns the reader, they are not always in agreement with one another. Still, there is a general harmony, and, we may add, there is a general agreement with the teachings of Catholic theology, which will enable the book to be of use to a Catholic preacher. The papers are thoughtfully written throughout and are interspersed, along with other extracts, with some graceful verses from the late Mr. Browning, and from Mr. Arthur C. Benson. The plates are partly from the Old Masters, partly from Mr. Gambier Parry's paintings, and one from Mr. F. Shield. They are well reproduced from photographs.

It was with pleasure some years ago that we called attention to Mr. Bernard Holland's *Letters of Mary Sibylla Holland*, his mother. Mrs. Holland was one who saw deeply into the meaning and significance of nature and life, and her appreciations are always delightful and often illuminating, whilst she was gifted with a singular power of correct and delicate expression. We are not surprised that the book has proved a favourite, and has now passed into its third edition, for it is an excellent stimulant to the higher life.

Messrs. Lethielleux send *Le Progrès du Liberalisme Catholique en France*, in two volumes, by the Abbé Emmanuel Barbier. In some respects it is a valuable book, for our contemporary controversies have always their antecedents, which so far as they belong to times not much behind our own are often difficult to retrace, and we welcome any book which brings all these antecedents together in a convenient form, especially if it includes a collection of important documents. M. Barbier's book enables a reader to trace in this way the stages of the religious movement in France since 1880, so far as it has tried to meet the various assaults on the Church, or the pressure of social problems. But it is impossible to think that the author aids the good cause of the Church by his unmeasured *intransigence*. True, the left wing of French Catholicism has, in several well-known instances, adopted principles which are quite irreconcilable with Catholic principles, but M. Barbier is

not content with refuting these in calm and becoming language. He shapes his indictment so that its blow may fall on people like Cardinal Lavigerie, on Comte Albert de Mun (up to a certain date) and the *ralliés* generally, on M. Piou and his *Action liberale populaire*. Nor only on these, for it would not be very wide of the mark to say that it is Leo XIII. who is reproached as the prime cause of the spread of "Liberalism" in the ranks of French Catholicism. "As a private person," he writes, "Leo XIII. was deceived in regard to questions of the highest importance, and his errors have had disastrous consequences. Unconsciously, but effectually and constantly, he lent his support to the enemies of the Church: and his government, which the Liberals extolled so loudly, singularly favoured their progress. . . . The Encyclicals of Leo XIII. contain the condemnation of his own policy." *Non tali auxilio*.

In his Preface to Father Knowles, O.S.A.'s *St. Brigid, the Patroness of Ireland* (Browne and Nolan), Bishop Foley, of Kildare and Leighlin, whilst praising him for furnishing his fellow-countrymen with an attractive Life of their great patron, delicately suggests that in itself the *Life* would have profited by a little preliminary criticism of the sources. To do this, indeed, in the case of a Saint whose days belonged to so remote an age, would have been to deprive her life of the wealth of beautiful legend which endears her to the hearts of her clients. So we must take the history and the legend together as two things inseparable, and after all, legends have their place in hagiography, and a true function in recording the history, if not of a Saint himself, at all events of the devotion of his clients. They are like the flowers, in fact, which these have laid at the foot of his shrine. In this sense Father Knowles has furnished a book that will take.

Medulla S. Thomæ Aquinatis, by P. Mézard, O.P. (Lethielleux), is a book of meditations gathered from the text of St. Thomas, and is in two small volumes. St. Thomas was one of those who could find in the simplest theme a wealth of pregnant thoughts, and these are what one requires as an aid in meditation. They are, too, if one may use the metaphor, thoroughly masculine thoughts, such as the English mind loves.

L'Esprit Saint (Lethielleux) is a little posthumous work of Mgr. Dupanloup's, and to say that of it is to say that the meditations it contains are nowhere commonplace and nowhere dry or unstimulating. In the first half he gathers gems from

Holy Scripture and the Fathers on the attributes of the Holy Ghost, in the second he makes his own personal reflections on the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church and in souls.

Conferences for Children on the Gospel of St. John (Burns and Oates) is by Sister Mary Teresa, O.S.B., of Princethorpe Priory. Mother Loyola, of York, besides the service she has rendered to the trainers of the young, by giving them her own valuable books, has stimulated others to follow her example. Sister Mary Teresa is one of these. That her little book will find its way into convents and Catholic homes we may be sure, but we may recommend it, at this time when so many are perplexed about Catholic atmosphere, to those who ask for the secret of the power our faith exercises on a child's mind and heart. *Prince and Saviour*, by Rosa Mulholland (M. H. Gill and Son), is a new edition of Lady Gilbert's story of our Lord's Life for very young children. *Patron Saints for Catholic Youth*, by Mary Mannix (Benziger), gives a brief account of the lives of eight favourite patrons of youth, four male and four female. The *Queen's Festivals* (Benziger), by a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus, is another aid for the religious instruction of children. Its manner is to give some account of the origin and history of the Feast rather than spiritual reflections suggested by its character.

When Love is Strong, by Grace Keon; *Harmony Flats*, by C. S. Whitmore; and *The Bell-Foundry*, by Otto von Sclaching (all published by Benziger), are stories for young people.

Magazines.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals:

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE. (1907, III.)
The Bible and Science. *L. Fonck*. The Penitential Discipline of the Western Church down to Callistus. *J. Stusler*. The Emperor Rudolf II. and the Bohemian situation in 1609. *A. Kröss*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE DES QUESTIONS HISTORIQUES. (1907, III.)
Persecution of Christians and the Religious Policy of the Roman Empire. *C. Callewaert*. Federalism in 1793-4. *Dr. Magnac*. Napoleon's Campaigns. The Transformation of the Republican Army into an Imperial Army. *Col. Picard*. The Episcopate of Cardinal de Belloy (1802-8). *De Lanzac de Laborie*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE. (1907, III.)

- St. Hilary's *Ad Constantium* and Historical Fragments. *A. Wilmart*. The Unprinted Commentary of the Latin Bishop Epiphanius on the Gospels. *G. Morin*. Fragments of Priscillianist Apocrypha. *D. De Bruyne*. The Irish idea of Martyrdom. *L. Gougaud*. The Restoration of Farfa in the Eleventh Century. *H. Schuster*. The Last Verse of the Acts. *D. De Bruyne*. The Anamnesis of the Roman Mass in the first half of the Fifth Century. *G. Morin*. The Roman Chancery in the Sixteenth Century. *R. Ancel*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE DES SCIENCES PHILOSOPHIQUES ET THÉOLOGIQUES. (1907, III.)

- An Essay in Pragmatist Synthesis. *A. Blanche*. What is the value of an internal Apologetic? *A. de Poulpique*. The Problem of Theological Sources in the Sixteenth Century. *A. Humbert*. The Term Semi-Pelagian. *M. Jacquin*. Recent Articles on the Science of Religions. Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (July 3.)

- The Picture of the Magi in Cologne Cathedral. *S. Beissel*. The Criteria of the Wealth of Nations. *H. Pesch*. The Angelic Hymn, *Gloria in Excelsis*. *C. Blume*. The Formation of Character. *M. Meschler*. The Flood of the Ganges. *J. Dahlmann*. Reviews, &c.

RAZÓN Y FÉ (July, 1907.)

- The Proposed Law upon Oaths and Affirmations. *V. Miteguiaga*. The Restoration of Studies down to the Time of Charlemagne. *R. Ruiz Amado*. The Ecclesiastical History of Spain in the first half of the Eighteenth Century. *G. Portillo*. The Social Movement. *N. Noguer*. A Unique Edition of Don Quixote. *J. Casanovas*. Reviews, &c.

REVUE AUGUSTINIENNE. (July 15.)

- The Virginal Conception of Jesus. *S. Protin*. An autograph and unpublished Letter of Mazarin. What is a Martyr? *P. Martain*. The Minimum of what we have to believe. *A. Unterleidner*. Mysticism. *C. Boulesteix*. Reviews, &c.

LA REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (July.)

- Cardinal Mermillod. *C. Woeste*. The Valuation of the Congo. *F. Goffart*. Three Groups of Martyrs under the Reign of Terror. *Countess de Courson*. Corsica in past ages. *P. della Rocca*. Huysmans, as he was known to his friends. *J. Ageorges*.

